UNIV. OF
TORONTO
LIBRARY

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/edinburghreviewo215londuoft

THE

EDINBURGH REVIEW

OR

CRITICAL JOURNAL:

FOR

JANUARY, 1912 . . . . APRIL, 1912

TO BE CONTINUED QUARTERLY.

JUDEX DAMNATUR CUM NOCENS ABSOLVITUR.
PUBLIUS SYRUS.

VOL. CCXV.

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
LONDON, BOMBAY, AND CALCUTTA.
LEONARD SCOTT PUBLICATION COMPANY, NEW YORK.

1912.

24 25.3
23 9 12

The Edinburgh Review

SPECIAL NOTICE

The next number of the EDINBURGH REVIEW will appear under the control of a new Editor, the seventh in succession to FRANCIS JEFFREY, who held the reins from the foundation of the Review in 1802 down to 1829. The succeeding Editors were MACVEY NAPIER, WILLIAM EMPSON, GEORGE CORNEWALL LEWIS, HENRY REEVE, and ARTHUR ELLIOT.

The proprietors feel confident that in placing the Review under the charge of Mr. HAROLD COX they have secured an Editor of whom it may be predicted that he will consistently maintain the principles which have been upheld by the "Edinburgh" for more than a century. The traditions of the "Edinburgh" have been to inculcate a sane and individualist liberalism—and under its new Editor the Review will be as strongly opposed to democratic tyranny and democratic corruption as it was in the early years of the Nineteenth Century to the tyranny and corruption of an aristocracy.

It will continue to defend the unity of the kingdom and to advocate those principles of personal liberty and personal responsibility from which liberalism should never be divorced. It will aim at promoting these causes by the dissemination of sound economic doctrine.

Every endeavour will be made to maintain the reputation of the Review for fair-minded and tolerant criticism in literature and art, and in the future, as in the past, cordial welcome will always be given to new ideas and new movements for the advancement of the nation.

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO.

39 Paternoster Row, London, E.C.,
April 17, 1912.

THE EDINBURGH REVIEW,

JANUARY, 1911—OCTOBER, 1911.

CONTENTS.

January, 1911. *No.* 435.

ARTICLE

I. English Prosody.
II. The United States and the Tariff.
III. The State and the Freedom of English Universities.
IV. The Principles of Heredity.
V. European Dominion in Asia.
VI. The Cost of Living of the Working Classes.
VII. Modern Developements in Ballad Art.
VIII. The Right to Work.
IX. Mary Stuart.
X. Our Tudor Kings.
XI. The Political Predicament.

April, 1911. *No.* 436.

ARTICLE

I. Lord Rosebery's Chatham.
II. The Origin of Land Plants.
III. The British Army and Modern Conceptions of War.
IV. The Pursuit of Reason.
V. The Historical Monuments of Great Britain and their Illustration in Hertfordshire and Berwickshire.
VI. Descriptive Sociology.
VII. The Conflict of Colour.
VIII. The Barbary Corsairs.
IX. Roman Scotland.
X. The Duchesse du Maine and her Court.
XI. Lord Goschen.

July, 1911. *No.* 437.

ARTICLE

I. The English Church of To-day.
II. The Battle of Fontenoy.
III. The Mind of Pascal.
IV. The Animal Story.
V. 'The Cockney Raphael.'
VI. Degeneration and Pessimism.
VII. Madame Roland.
VIII. English Public Life.
IX. Lyof Nikolayevitch Tolstoy.
X. The Coronation and the Constitutional Question.

October, 1911. *No.* 438.

ARTICLE

I. Fogazzaro and Modernism.
II. The History of the Inns of Court.
III. The Collapse of the First Coalition.
IV. Famous Autobiographies.
V. The Sovereignty of the Sea.
VI. The Camorra in Modern Italy.
VII. A Crisis in the History of the Republican Party—Reciprocity, Tariff Revision and Mr. Taft.
VIII. The Government and the Country.
IX. Gambetta's 'War Office' in 1870-71.
X. The Duke of Devonshire.

JANUARY, 1912. No. 439.

ARTICLE

I. THE PLACE OF DOCTRINE IN WAR.

II. THE ELIZABETHAN PLAYWRIGHT.

III. CHATHAM AND THE COUNTRY LIFE OF HIS DAY.

IV. AUGUSTE RODIN AND HIS FRENCH CRITICS.

V. THE WESSEX DRAMA.

VI. CHANGES OF CURRENT IN POLITICAL THOUGHT.

VII. THE SOVEREIGNTY OF THE AIR.

VIII. WILLIAM PITT.

IX. RUSSO-CHINESE RELATIONS (A.D. 1224–1912).

X. SCOTTISH SONGSTRESSES.

XI. GREAT BRITAIN AND EUROPE.

CONTENTS OF No. 439.

Page

ART. I.—1. The Science of War. By the late Colonel G. F. R. Henderson, C.B. Edited by Captain Neill Malcolm, D.S.O. London. Longmans, Green and Co. 1905.

2. Des Principes de la Guerre. Conférences faites à l'Ecole Supérieure de Guerre. Par le Colonel d'Artillerie F. Foch. (Deuxième édition.) Paris: Berger-Levrault et Cie. 1906. 1

[And other Works.]

II.—1. Elizabethan Drama. By F. C. Schelling. 2 vols. London: Constable and Co. 1908.

2. The Cambridge History of English Literature. Edited by A. W. Ward and A. R. Waller. Vols. v. and vi. Cambridge: The University Press. 1910. 31

[And other Works.]

III.—1. Observations on Modern Gardening. [By Whately.] New edition with notes by Horace [late] E. of Orford. London. 1801.

2. Memorials of Admiral Gambier. By Lady Chatterton. London. 1861.

3. The Stowe Catalogue. By Henry Rumsey Foster. London. 1848. 58

[And other Works.]

IV.—1. L'Art. Auguste Rodin. Entretiens réunis par Paul Gsell. Paris, rue des Saints-Pères: Grasset. 1911.

2. Auguste Rodin. By Camille Mauclair. Translated by Clementina Black. London: Duckworth. 1905.

3. Auguste Rodin. By Rudolf Kahn. 1909.

4. Auguste Rodin. By Rudolf Dircks. 1904.

5. Rodin. By Léon Riotor. Paris. 1903.

6. Life and Work of Auguste Rodin. By Frederick Lawton. 1906. 74

[And other Works.]

V.—1. Thomas Hardy, Penseur et Artiste. Étudié dans les romans de Wessex, par F. A. Hedgcock, Docteur-ès-lettres. Paris: Hachette. 1911.

2. The Wessex Novels. Macmillan's Pocket Hardy. 1909. 93

Page

VI.—1. Syndicalism and Labour. By Sir Arthur Clay, Bart. London: Murray. 1911.
2. The Province of the State. By Sir Roland K. Wilson, Bart. London: P. S. King and Son. 1911.
3. The Future of England. By the Hon. George Peel. London: Macmillan. 1911. 113

VII.—1. The Aeroplane, Past, Present, and Future. By C. Graham White and H. Harper. London: Werner Laurie. 1911.
2. The Conquest of the Air. By Alphonse Berget. London: W. Heinemann. 1909.
3. Mes trois Grandes Courses. Par André Beaumont. Paris: Hachette. 1912. 141

VIII.—1. William Pitt and National Revival. By J. Holland Rose, Litt.D. London: G. Bell. 1911.
2. William Pitt and the Great War. By J. Holland Rose, Litt.D. London: G. Bell. 1911.
3. British Statesmen of the Great War, 1793–1814: Ford Lectures for 1911. By the Hon. J. W. Fortescue. Oxford. 1911. 158

[And other Works.]

IX.—1. China. Imperial Maritime Customs. III. Miscellaneous Series, No. 30. Treaties, Conventions, etc., between China and Foreign States. Shanghai. 1908.
2. Treaties between the Empire of China and Foreign Powers. (1st edit. By W. F. Mayers. 1877.) 5th edition. Shanghai. 1906.
3. The International Relations of the Chinese Empire. The Period of Conflict (1834–1860). By Hosea Ballou Morse. 1911. 190

[And other Works.]

X.—1. Songs and Verses. By Lady John Scott. Edited, with a Memoir, by her Grandniece, Margaret Warrender. Edinburgh: David Douglas. 1911.
2. The Spindle-Side of Scottish Song. By Jessie P. Findlay. London: J. M. Dent and Co. 1902 . 213

XI.—1. Speeches by the Rt. Hon. Sir Edward Grey, Bart., M.P., in the House of Commons, 27th of November and 14th of December 1911.
2. Speeches by Lord Courtney of Penwith, Lord Morley of Blackburn and the Marquess of Lansdowne, in the House of Lords, 28th of November 1911.
3. Memoirs and Letters of the Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Morier, G.C.B., from 1826 to 1876. By his daughter Mrs. Rosslyn Wemyss. London: Edward Arnold. 1911. 243

CONTENTS OF No. 440.

Page

ART. I.—1. The Life of John Henry Cardinal Newman. By Wilfrid Ward. London: Longmans. 1912.

2. History of My Religious Opinions. By J. H. Newman, D.D. London: Longmans. 1869. . 263

II.—1. The Antiquities of the Jews. By Flavius Josephus, A.D. 93. Translated by W. Whiston. 1814.

2. Atta Troll, ein Sommernachts Traum, caput xviii–xx. By H. Heine. 1847.

3. Hérodias (Trois Contes). By Gustave Flaubert. Paris. 1877. 291

[And other Works.]

III.—1. Select Cases before the King's Council in the Star Chamber, commonly called the Court of Star Chamber. Edited for the Selden Society. By I. S. Leadam. 2 vols. London. 1902 and 1910.

2. A Study of the Court of Star Chamber. By Cora L. Scofield. Chicago. 1900.

3. Treatise of the Court of Star Chamber. By William Hudson. Collectanea Juridica (1792), vol. ii., pp. 1–240. 318

IV.—1. Aristotle on the Art of Poetry, a revised text with critical introduction, translation and commentary. By Ingram Bywater. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1909.

2. The Poetics of Aristotle, translated from Greek into English and from Arabic into Latin, with a revised text, introduction, commentary, glossary and onomasticon. By D. S. Margoliouth. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1911. . . 337

V.—1. Manuel d'Archéologie. Par Joseph Déchelette. Paris: Librairie Alphonse Picard et Fils. 1908. 1910.

2. Ancient Hunters and their Modern Representatives. By W. J. Sollas, F.R.S. London: Macmillan and Co. 1911.

3. Ancient Types of Man. By Arthur Keith. London: Harper and Brothers. 1911. . . 358

[And other Works.]

VI.—1. Lectures on the English Comic Writers. By William Hazlitt. 1818.

2. The Physiology of Laughter. By Herbert Spencer. 'Macmillan's Magazine.' March 1860. 'Collected Essays.' Vol. II.

Page

3. An Essay on Comedy. By George Meredith. 1877.
4. An Essay on Laughter. By James Sully, M.A., LL.D. Longmans, Green and Co. 1902. . . 383

[And other Works.]

VII.—1. Encyclopædia Britannica. 11th Edition. 'Peace.' By Sir Thomas Barclay. Cambridge University Press. 1911.
2. Memoiren. Bertha von Suttner. Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt : Stuttgart and Leipzig. 1909.
3. Le Passé de la Guerre et l'Avenir de la Paix. Charles Richet. Librairie Paul Ollendorff : Paris. 1907. 405

[And other Works.]

VIII.—1. Rapport du Président de la Commission pour l'établissement d'une carte de la terre à l'échelle de 1 : 1,000,000. (Sixth International Geographical Congress. London. 1895.)
2. Die Erdkarte im Massstab 1 : 1,000,000. Von Prof. Dr. Albrecht Penck ; and Résolutions et Vœux : I. The Map of the World on the scale of 1 : 1,000,000. (Neuvième Congrès International de Géographie, Genève, 1908.)
3. Resolutions and Proceedings of the International Map Committee assembled in London, November 1909. London. 1910. 434

[And other Works.]

IX.—1. House of Commons Debates, 1896–1911. Ottawa : Government Printing Bureau.
2. Official Report of the Liberal Convention, 1893. Toronto : Budget Printing and Publishing Company. 1893.
3. Report of Proceedings in the Hearing by Members of the Government of the Farmers' Delegation, December 16, 1910. Ottawa : C. H. Parmelee, King's Printer. 1910. 450

[And other Works.]

X.—1. Some Principles of Maritime Strategy. By Julian S. Corbett, LL.M. London : Longmans. 1911.
2. Naval Strategy : compared and contrasted with the Principles and Practice of Military Operations on Land. By Captain A. T. Mahan, D.C.L., LL.D., United States Navy. London : Sampson Low. 1911. 485

XI.—1. The King's Speech on Opening Parliament. February 1912.
2. The Framework of Home Rule. By Erskine Childers. London : Edward Arnold. 1911. . 515

[And other Works.]

THE

EDINBURGH REVIEW,

JANUARY, 1912.*

No. CCCCXXXIX.

Art. I.—THE PLACE OF DOCTRINE IN WAR.

1. *The Science of War.* By the late Colonel G. F. R. Henderson, C.B. Edited by Captain Neill Malcolm, D.S.O. London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1905.
2. *Des Principes de la Guerre.* Conférences faites à l'Ecole Supérieure de Guerre, par le Colonel d'Artillerie F. Foch. (Deuxième édition.) Paris: Berger-Levrault et Cie. 1906.
3. *The Developement of Strategical Science during the Nineteenth Century.* By Lieut.-General von Caemmerer. Authorised translation by Karl von Donat. London: Hugh Rees Ltd. 1905.

I

In the last year of the eighteenth century a German Romantic, whose frail body was the servant of a mind endowed with insight beyond the common, wrote these words:

'The practical man wholly rejects bare Theory, without 'suspecting how problematic must be the answer to the 'questions—whether Theory exists for the sake of Applica-'tion, or Application for the sake of Theory.'

It is thus that Novalis voices a thought ever present, though in different forms, to those whose task it is to-day to train and prepare our army for war. It is just this fact which differentiates the British army of 1912 from that of the past, even the recent past, for it is not so long since the practical British soldier rejected bare theory; war to him was all

* All rights reserved.

application. That generation, the direct heirs in tail of former generations of British officers, has passed away, leaving the destinies of the army in the hands of the men who sat at the feet of Henderson, and learnt from that inspiring teacher that

'In all ages the power of intellect has asserted itself in war. It was not courage and experience only that made Hannibal, Alexander, and Caesar the greatest names of antiquity. Napoleon, Wellington, and the Archduke Charles were certainly the best educated soldiers of their time; while Lee, Jackson, and Sherman probably knew more of war before they made it than anyone else in the United States. But it was not until 1866 and 1870 that the preponderating influence of the trained mind was made manifest. Other wars had shown the value of an educated General, these showed the value of an educated army.'*

Since the South African War there has been throughout the army a movement which may well be called an intellectual revival. One manifestation of this revival is the interest now taken in this or that doctrine of war presented in the writings of a variety of authors, usually French or German soldiers of repute.

Perhaps the time has come for an examination, not of the inherent soundness or otherwise of this or that doctrine, but rather of the question of doctrine itself in relation to war, and to the training of an army for war. What is meant by a doctrine of war? Is the notion or concept of doctrine in harmony with the principles of command? Clearly if the concept is itself not in harmony with the principles of command, it were better for an army to hold no doctrine, and therefore the search for a suitable doctrine would be proved vain before it is undertaken.

A noticeable feature in most discussions on military questions is that the different parties to the discussion attach to the same terms different meanings, usually leading to complete misunderstanding. To avoid this it is as well to define terms as they are used.

From the alternative meanings given in the 'Concise Oxford 'Dictionary' we have selected the following:—

'A principle is a fundamental truth as a basis of reasoning.'

'Command is control, mastery, possession.'

From these definitions it follows that 'the principles of 'command,' as regards the command in the field of an army, are 'the fundamental truths which are the bases of reasoning 'about the control or mastery of an army in the field.'

From this definition itself springs the first fundamental

* The Science of War, p. 3.

truth about command, that it implies control or mastery of an army by a commander. From this first fundamental truth follows the corollary that an army is trained, organised, and employed in such a manner as to admit of control or mastery; clearly if any body of troops is so trained, organised, or employed as not to admit of control or mastery, that body of troops, whatever else it may be, most certainly is not commanded. This is the second principle of command. But the command, control or mastery of a body of troops is useless unless it tends to the accomplishment of the end in view in war—the defeat of an enemy in battle. Any species of command, control or mastery which conflicts with this end is bad and is to be discarded. Hence it follows that the third principle of command is that the commander should have a clear idea of how he proposes to use the instrument in his hand for the purpose for which it was forged—the winning of battles—that he should in fact possess adequate knowledge and capacity. Thus the principles of command resolve themselves into: (1) control by a commander; (2) an army controllable by a commander; (3) a commander who knows how he intends to use his army.

To ascertain the bearing of doctrine upon the harmony or discord of the principles of command it will be necessary to look back to some of the great wars that have been, in order that we may trace the relation to one another of the three fundamental truths which are the bases of reasoning about the command of troops. It is only by such an examination of the mutual relations of the principles of command that we can hope to estimate correctly the true function of doctrine in war. This is to invert the usual process. As a rule some writer or thinker on war—by no means the same thing!—finds or evolves a doctrine, or general body of teaching, to which he assents. Promptly that doctrine is preached as a panacea for all the ills which the military flesh and mind are heirs to. It seems to us that the more reasonable process would be to seek in military history the effect which has been produced on the command of troops in war by adherence, or non-adherence, to a common body of instruction. If adherence to a doctrine has made for harmony in the principles of command, then a doctrine is a good thing; if it has made for discord in those principles, then it is a bad thing, and the formulation of doctrine is to be avoided. This does not entail appraisement of any particular doctrine, nor does it imply that, for the immediate purpose we have put before us, it is incumbent on us to trace the influence on an army of adherence to an unsound doctrine, such as the belief

in the superiority of defence over attack which the French army held in 1870.

The period of the great Frederick is as convenient as any other in the history of war to take as a starting point for this inquiry into the relationship between doctrine and the principles of command.

In the eighteenth century armies were small. The muskets of the infantry had an effective range of only 200 yards, the artillery possessed but little mobility. The object of a commander was to get as many muskets as close to the enemy as possible, preferably against a flank where there would be fewer muskets to injure his men during the operation, and then, after an overwhelming fire at close range, to proceed to a bayonet attack which was always successful if the enemy had been sufficiently shaken at the point assailed. For success it was essential that a commander should have sufficient control over his army to ensure the delivery of a knockdown blow by the army working as a rigid whole. The tactical conditions of the time admitted of the complete mastery of the commander over his troops. The army moved, manœuvred, attacked and fired if not, as is sometimes erroneously stated, as one man at the command of one man, still sufficiently so as to ensure complete cohesion and the simultaneous execution of the commander's will. There was practically no delegation of responsibility within an army—the commander's control of his army was so complete that delegation of responsibility was unnecessary, and to be deprecated as tending to impair cohesion of effort, which could more readily be attained by maintaining unimpaired the immediate supervision of the commander. This state of affairs lasted till the period of the Revolutionary wars.

In 1765, only a few years before the outbreak of the Revolution, the reforms of Gribeauval had led to the adoption by the French army of a mobile equipment for the artillery. Although the infantry weapon had improved but little, the advance in mobility of the artillery now enabled a commander to intensify the fire brought to bear against a portion of the hostile army by concentrating guns. With this progress in the artillery, and partly consequent on it, came the organisation of French armies into autonomous divisions of all arms. This work had been begun before the Revolution by the Maréchal de Broglie as early as 1759, it was greatly developed by Carnot when he organised victory for the Committee of Public Safety, it reached its prime under Napoleon, who grouped divisions into army corps of from 17,000 to 45,000 men.

With this advance in organisation and in artillery the French army gradually modified its infantry tactics, so that at the outbreak of the Revolution the army was familiar with the idea that the rigid line formations in vogue in Prussia and Austria could best be met by the attack of mobile flexible columns, preceded by swarms of skirmishers. The immense importance of these changes in organisation and tactics was grasped by the leaders of thought in France, notably Bourcet, Guibert and du Theil, through whose teaching the younger generation of French officers, especially artillery officers, including Bonaparte, became imbued with the doctrine of economy of forces.

This doctrine is based on the principle that a formation of all arms, such as a division, could not be destroyed by even greatly superior force for some hours, provided it had space in which to fight a delaying action, the 'combat en retraite' which is an integral part of French methods of war at the present day. Similarly an army corps, with space in which to manœuvre, could resist superior numbers for about a day.

The doctrine of economy of forces applied to an army equipped with a mobile artillery, trained in a flexible system of tactics, and organised as were the French Revolutionary and Imperial armies, enabled a commander to assign a part of his army to seeking for a decision at one point, while allotting other parts to minor objectives, such as immobilising the enemy, inducing him to expend his reserves prematurely, or threatening his rear.

On the wider field of the theatre of war the formation first of autonomous divisions, and later of army corps, allowed the principle of the economy of forces to be applied to strategy as well as to tactics, and thus made possible the Napoleonic campaigns. The resulting gain in flexibility and in power of manœuvre had to be paid for in that the control of a commander over his army was no longer the absolute mastery which was the prerogative of the commanders of a previous generation. To the soldiers of the twentieth century, the control over his army in battle exercised by Napoleon seems so complete that it is only by comparing a Napoleonic battle with one of Frederick's that one can appreciate the change that had come over the art of command. Yet that change was so marked that the formalists of Austria and Prussia, until constant defeat taught them wisdom, held that the battles of the Revolution were chaotic butcheries, compared to the stately encounters of the days of their youth, when Generals really had their armies in hand and skilful manœuvres were the rule!

Frederick moved his army on the battlefield by orders which were more akin to what we would call 'words of command' than to 'orders' properly so called. That is to say, in the neighbourhood of the hostile line of battle he would order his army to go 'sections right wheel,' then to 'move off.' Having reached the desired point, he would order 'sections 'left wheel,' thus forming line again, and then he would order 'the line to attack.' These orders, or words of command, were transmitted very rapidly to the unit commanders by numerous aides-de-camps and adjutants, and the army moved as one whole.

Napoleon, on the other hand, moved his army on the battlefield by orders verbal or written to his corps commanders which allotted to each corps a definite task; how that task was to be carried out he almost invariably left to the discretion of the corps commander.

The form of Napoleon's orders to the different corps *for a battle* depended on the circumstances at the moment, but as a rule they were comprised in one written order dictated to his Chief of the Staff, though sometimes the orders were verbal. Usually, whether verbal or written, they were explained on the spot to the assembled marshals, whose various objectives were pointed out to them.

Between Frederick and Napoleon there is then a difference in command, but it is a difference in the methods of command and not in the *principles* of command. In the case of Frederick and of Napoleon, so far as the battlefield is concerned, the three principles of command are to be found present and in harmony, though each principle has altered in its application: (*a*) the commander controls sufficiently for his purpose; (*b*) the troops are trained and organised to respond adequately to the control exercised; (*c*) the commander knows how he means to fight his battle.

Where the theatre of war is concerned, however, Napoleon sometimes failed to harmonise in his army the three principles of command, and to this want of harmony his ultimate overthrow is largely, though not entirely, to be attributed. Just as every battle which Napoleon ever fought, from Castiglione to Waterloo, may be referred to one of two possible variations of a fundamental plan which he always strove to carry out, so in his operations on the theatre of war leading up to battle it is possible to trace what he himself refers to as 'le vrai système basé sur les principes de la guerre,' or sometimes, more briefly, as 'mon système.'

In strategy as in tactics Napoleon kept ever in view an

ideal which he reached sometimes in full, as at Ulm and Jena, but more often only partially as at Bautzen and Landshut, and sometimes completely failed to achieve, as at Wilna in 1812, before Dresden in 1813, and during the Waterloo campaign. He was however not the slave of his own ideal, and though he strove ever for a battle in conformity with that ideal, he was ready to snatch at any possible victory that offered even when his preparations to make it decisive were not ideally perfect. Put briefly, the ideal Napoleon aimed at in operations was, if possible, not to fight a decisive battle until he had shaken the hostile commander's nerve, and disorganised command in his army, by seizing and holding his possible lines of retreat. This usually involved manœuvring around the enemy. But to manœuvre around an enemy who is not held, and consequently is free to move anywhere, is likely to lead to a blow in the air. Hence the necessity of detachments to hold the enemy, and of other detachments to stop him should he try to break away by roads not occupied by the main body of the French army. An example of the success of this essentially Napoleonic operation is Jena. From the 10th to 13th of October Napoleon sets about the preparation of a decisive battle on the line Erfurt-Weimar.* To deprive his opponent of his line of retreat on Dresden, Napoleon seizes the Weimar-Jena-Dresden road at Gera, and pushes a detachment of two corps and cavalry (Bernadotte, Davout and Murat) to Naumberg to intercept the road Weimar-Kösen-Mersburg-Leipzig, the enemy's second line of retreat. The enemy's third line of retreat, viâ Nordhausen and Magdeburg, is for the present out of his reach, but it is the longest way round to Berlin, to which capital Napoleon is on the shorter road—so it can safely be neglected for the moment. To find and probably, as certain French writers suggest, to hold the enemy two corps (Lannes and Augereau) were pushed to Jena on the direct road to Weimar, his supposed position. The success of the operation turned on the ability of the detachment commanders to play their part.

The French corps commanders of 1806 were accustomed to being a day's march from the main body of the army, understood how to fight a delaying action with their corps, and knew that a detachment of the strength of a corps which had room to manœuvre could not well be destroyed before the main army intervened on the flank or rear of the enemy. And in fact, in

* Camon, 'La Guerre Napoleonienne: Les Batailles,' p. 146 *et seq.*

this instance, Lannes and Davout did play their part to perfection. The Prussian commanders, alarmed at the move against their direct lines of retreat on Dresden and Berlin, endeavoured to escape by way of Kösen and Merseburg; Davout headed off the king's army at Auerstädt while the main French army reinforced Lannes, who on the 13th had found Hoehenlohe's army at Jena, where it was destroyed on the 14th. Davout's victory had the effect of crowding into one day results which on Napoleon's plan would unquestionably have been achieved in two days if instead of winning a battle at Auerstädt on the 14th Davout had made his adversary waste the whole of that day in pushing him back a few miles, or if, finding no enemy on the Kösen-Merseburg road, he had been free to intervene in the main battle.

The action of Lannes on the 13th, and of Davout on the 14th, showed that those marshals understood Napoleon's method of war and knew what he was trying to do. His letters to those two marshals in the days preceding Jena are those of a man writing to men who know how his mind works; he puts before them the situation as he knows it; sends one to Naumburg and the other to Jena in the full confidence that they will know that they are to seize on to the enemy, and give the main army time to come up. In this campaign it is clear that the three principles of command harmonised, inasmuch as Napoleon had a definite idea of how he meant to win; had sufficient mastery over his army to enable him to move his detachments in the directions he wished, and to bring up the main body at the right time and place; and, lastly, that he had at his disposal an instrument suited to his method of war in the detachments commanded by Lannes and by Davout, and the main body commanded by himself.

Later on in his career he attempted similar operations and failed, in great measure because his detachments were no longer commanded by men up to the standard of Lannes and Davout, a high standard, essential to the success of Napoleonic war.

For instance in 1813 Napoleon wrote to Marmont* explaining his scheme of operations, and asked for that marshal's opinion. Marmont's reply contains this sentence: 'It is to be feared 'that on the same day your Majesty wins a great victory, you 'will learn that your subordinates have lost two.' Marmont knew that his comrades in arms, with but few exceptions, were

* Letter of the 13th of August.

not fit for the command of armies, however skilful they might be in handling their own army corps. The defeats of Oudinot at Gross Beeren, of Macdonald on the Katsbach, and of Ney at Dennevitz fulfilled Marmont's prophecy within four weeks, and are a standing proof that in 1813 Napoleon's army was not adequately controllable by the commander, and was in fact not controlled by him except when he was present in person. But the form of war he made depended for success, as in 1805 and 1806, on the skilful command of detachments, though the detachments had grown in 1813 from detached corps to detached armies. True, he himself, the commander, still knew what he wanted to do, but since his detachment commanders no longer played their part intelligently his army can no longer be considered controllable for the purpose in view, and, as a consequence, his mastery over his army was no longer adequate. This meant that in Napoleon's army in the later campaigns the first and second principles of command no longer harmonised with the third principle of command.

Of course this was not the sole cause of Napoleon's defeats: to examine into the reasons of his failure to enslave Europe is not germane to our present subject, except in so far as they bear on the inter-relation of the principles of command. It will be sufficient to note that where Napoleon succeeded he was enabled to give harmonious expression in his army to the three principles of command, and that where he was not able to do so he failed.

What is of importance, and of direct bearing on the training and employment of the British army to-day, is to examine the underlying causes of the inadequacy of Napoleon's army in 1813 and 1815 to carry out the master's conceptions. Unquestionably the material of the army had deteriorated, the ranks were full of half-trained conscripts who were not the equal in fighting worth of the veterans of the Grande Armée. Yet when one thinks of how the immature lads of Victor's and Marmont's corps marched 120 miles in four days by one single road, through a country almost destitute of supplies, in order to fight at Dresden, one is forced to admit that it was not the *men* of the French army so much as their leaders who failed the Emperor. The leaders indeed were the weak link in the chain of command which bound the legs and muskets of the men to the mind of the commander. The story of 1813 and of 1815 is essentially the story of the failure of the marshals. This failure, if analysed, will be seen to comprise two distinct elements: firstly, a definite want of technical skill in the

handling of armies or formations of more than one corps; and, secondly, inability to follow the working of Napoleon's mind, with consequent failure to understand the method which was the expression in action of his thought.

Macdonald's operations on the Katsbach are a good example of this two-fold failure in comprehension of his commander, and in skill in leading his army.

In order to prevent the army of Silesia, under Blücher, from interfering either with his own operations against Schwarzenberg, or with Oudinot's march on Berlin, Napoleon left Macdonald in August 1813 with the army of the Bober to contain Blücher, who was about equal to him in strength. In his instructions to Macdonald, Napoleon first orders him to occupy a position of observation on the Bober, which is clearly not an offensive measure. At the same time he tells him that if the enemy advances, and thereby commits himself to a march in several columns, he should concentrate his army and attack the dispersed army of the enemy while in movement. The conception underlying these orders is the Napoleonic idea of the defensive, of which the operations on the Adige in 1796, when covering the siege of Mantua, are a good example, the essence being that no forward movement shall take place until the enemy had divided his army and is offering it up to attack in detail—then blow on blow, right and left, as fast as weary men can be driven to battle. A recent French writer, Colonel Camon,* maintains that Macdonald completely misunderstood his instructions, assumed the offensive, and did so clumsily, advancing in two masses separated by a deep ravine. Blücher contained the mass on the French right with a small force, and threw the bulk of his army against the mass on the French left, routed it, and drove it back upon the Katsbach.

The operations of Grouchy on the 17th and 18th of June 1815 are another instance, though in great measure excusable, of that failure to understand the Emperor, and of lack of skill in commanding a strong detachment, which became so marked a feature among the marshals during Napoleon's later campaigns. It will now be sufficient to recognise the fact as a fact and to seek for its causes, wasting no more time on further examples.

The explanation usually offered for the failure of the marshals is that Napoleon's orders were so precise, so rigid,

* 'La Guerre Napoleonienne : les Systèmes d'Opérations,' pp. 252 and 271.

and demanded so unreasoning an obedience that he had crushed in his lieutenants the spirit of intelligent enterprise and self-reliance which our modern nomenclature, following the German, has dubbed 'the initiative.' This is the explanation dear to the neo-Moltkeans who, through translations of the works of Prince Kraft, von der Goltz, and Caemmerer, appear to have captured contemporary English military thought on the subject of Napoleon. Even York v. Wartenburg, although no neo-Moltkean, repeats this statement. We believe it to be so unfounded that no one who has read with an open mind even half a dozen volumes of Napoleon's correspondence could be deceived by it. But the reading must be done with a mind unbiased, and free to receive impression by the mind of Napoleon as exposed in his letters: we must pay the dead commander the small compliment of honestly seeking in his letters what really was his relation to his various correspondents —what did he think, at bottom, of the men he wrote to?

Now Napoleon's letters reveal much about himself, his correspondents, and his outlook on war, statecraft and organisation. Before accepting any neo-Moltkean estimate of the relations between Napoleon and his marshals, it is as well to see for oneself what Napoleon thought of them. His style varies according to whom he is writing to. For instance, to Davout, almost always, and often to Marmont, Soult, Massena and Saint-Cyr, he writes as to men capable of understanding him and his thoughts. To Ney, Junot, Macdonald, Oudinot, Bessières, his letters are rather those of a grown-up man to a child; the Napoleon who is willing to admit the intellectual equality of a Talleyrand or Davout is content to give the mere fighter orders which even the stupidest of soldiers cannot fail to obey. It is not unnatural to find that for one letter explaining a situation to a man like Davout, and directing him to act in conformity with an intention which is communicated to him, the Napoleon correspondence teems with precise, definite orders to marshals of the type which goes astray unless restrained in the strait-jacket of formal prescription. The fact is that the majority of the marshals were not fit to be trusted with any strategic initiative. In tactics, in the actual manner in which they carried out their tactical *rôle*, Napoleon did give them considerable latitude for the display of initiative within the strict limits of the task set; they were one and all fine fighters, of great battle experience, and abundantly capable of commanding their army corps as units in a battle under the master's eye. To command a detachment, still more so a

detached army working wide on the strategic chess-board, is a very different affair to commanding one corps working close alongside other corps: it is a high test of intellect, and of trained and cultured intellect at that. It is known now how the mind of Napoleon was tuned at Auxonne to the doctrines of the original thinkers on war of whose teachings his methods bear so strong a stamp. At the right age he was placed in the right environment, and possessed the right kind of intellect to receive, ripen and develope the teaching he received. Can the same be said for his marshals? With but few exceptions the marshals of Napoleon rose from the ranks of the Revolutionary army. Before the whirlwind of 1792 tore them from the bosom of the middle and lower classes of a nation in which education was not yet widely diffused it is safe to assume that they had probably never thought about war, and certainly had not been in position to assimilate the doctrines which had begun to permeate the corps of officers of the old Royal army. It is a significant fact that the ablest of the marshals, he in whose capacity for command the Emperor had the highest confidence, he who seems to have understood best the working of his master's mind, Marshal Davout, was a scion of the old nobility, trained in the Ecole Militaire at Paris, and at the time of the Revolution held a commission in the cavalry regiment of Champagne. The mental environment, at a receptive age, of Davout and of Marmont, an artillery officer formed in the great artillery school of Châlons, was very possibly not unlike that which influenced the mind of Napoleon in his youth and gave it a definite bias towards what is now known as the Napoleonic conception of war. This cannot have been so in the case of the majority of the marshals. Hence when Napoleon found them rising men, experienced in the practice of war, with reputations already great, won on the battlefields of the Revolutionary armies, the future marshals of France cannot have had much in common with the mentality of their master. Napoleon had to make the most of the material to hand; he had neither time nor opportunity, and perhaps had not the wish, to train their minds to work in unison with his own in solving the larger problems of war. From 1796 to 1815 the French army only enjoyed a brief spell of peace. It is not during the stress and strain of war, when every wheel of the military machine is working at high pressure to grind out concrete results in the shape of movements, operations, battles, that an army can be trained. An army is used in war; it can only be trained in peace; more especially is it only in times of peace that the minds of subordinate

commanders can be tuned so as to ensure in war the unity of thought and of effort which are essential factors in harmonising the principles of command.

The characteristic feature of the wars which, after those of Napoleon, next command attention, is the recognition of this fact by one master mind, and the influence on operations directly attributable to this recognition.

In 1857 Moltke became chief of the General Staff of the Prussian army. In character silent, solitary, and a great worker, he was endowed with a balanced mind which enabled him to weigh calmly the strength and weakness of an adversary against the moral and material forces of which he himself disposed. He not only had the power of exacting from his subordinates work as tireless as his own, but possessed the gift of creating colleagues imbued with his teaching and formed to some degree in his own image. Moltke was not only widely read in military history, but was a deep thinker on war. He had studied the best books that had been written up to his day on the campaigns of Napoleon, and had not omitted to note that one important element in the ultimate overthrow of the Emperor was the failure of the marshals: the failure to harmonise the principles of command owing to the neglect to provide for the army subordinate commanders capable of intelligent co-operation when removed from the immediate control of the commander-in-chief. It would seem that Moltke resolved that whether the army of Prussia succeeded or failed when tested in war, its failure should not be attributable to neglect of this particular lesson of history.*

The essence of Moltke's doctrine is contained in the following extract from his 'Instructions for the Superior Leaders of Troops,' issued as a confidential document in 1869 and since published by the Great General Staff. After discussing the difficulty of enveloping an enemy by the advance of one concentrated army, he continues:

'Incomparably more favourably will things shape themselves if on the day of battle all the forces can be concentrated from different points towards the field of battle itself—in other words, if the operations have been conducted in such a manner that a final short march from different points leads all available forces simultaneously upon the front and flanks of the adversary. In that case strategy has done the best it can ever hope to attain, and great results must be the consequence.'†

* The Science of War, p. 7.

† Quoted by v. Caemmerer in 'The Developement of Strategical Science,' p. 218.

In this dictum of Moltke is to be found the fertile seed from which sprang the battlefield concentration at Sadowa in 1866, the successive attempts to envelop the French army in August 1870, and the final triumph over the Imperial army of France ringed round by fire on the 1st of September at Sedan.

Although the document in which this doctrine is embodied is dated 1869, the doctrine itself took shape in Moltke's mind years before. Moltke was born in 1800, he was fifty-seven when he became Chief of the Great General Staff. It is not at that age that men formulate in their own minds the doctrines which colour their outlook on the problems of a profession in which they have grown grey. It is when the mind is fresh, eager, and susceptible to impression by study and reflexion, that the principles of an art are examined and sorted into groups of varying importance and interdependence, and that in this process of selection is born that general trend of belief and teaching which we know as 'doctrine.' Moltke came to the post of Chief of the Great General Staff in 1857 a convinced believer in the methods of war which he practised in 1866 and 1870. During the years which passed between 1857 and that fateful night in July 1870 when Bismarck, by altering the text of the Ems telegram, goaded France into the fit of madness which led to Metz and Sedan, Moltke had worked ceaselessly at the preparation of the Prussian army for war as he intended to wage it. Although the method of operation which he favoured differed from that of Napoleon, it had this in common with later campaigns of the Emperor, that it required commanders of detachments, possessed not only of a high degree of technical skill but able to see eye to eye with their chief, with minds trained to work in unison with that of the higher command, even when separated from Royal Headquarters by a distance which made direct control impossible. The growth of armies in mere numbers made such a training of the subordinate commanders more imperative than ever. The very nature of the war of masses imposes the obligation of thoroughly indoctrinating an army destined to wage it whatever method of operations be adopted. The small army of 1796 with which Bonaparte fought and overcame a succession of Austrian armies in a theatre of war which was neither the soil of France nor that of Austria—the small army which waged what we may call an 'expeditionary war' in Italy—had given place to the great National army which counted its effectives by the hundred thousand, and was organised for war on a great scale for the defence of the fatherland by invading the territory of a contiguous nation.

The method of war which Moltke intended to use in the struggle with France, for which he had begun to prepare definitely in 1859, was the outcome of the doctrine of war which he held, and postulated the advance of columns on a broad front. The danger of such a method is the defeat in detail of those columns before they can concentrate on the front and flanks of the enemy on the selected battlefield. To guard against this danger the operations of each column must be so bold and so energetic that the initiative is not allowed to pass into the hands of the hostile commander. Every column commander, as he comes to grips with an enemy, perhaps stronger than himself, must feel confident that his comrades to the right and left see the situation as he sees it, and will attack vigorously to take the pressure off him and help to envelop the enemy he is engaged with. In the columns themselves the same situation reproduces itself. As far as each column commander can, he will endeavour to envelop the actual fraction of the enemy he is engaged with, and consequently will move his command on a comparatively wide front. From the subordinate commanders in his column he will demand the same energy, self-reliance, and understanding of the situation which the supreme commander has required from him, and this is true whether those subordinate commanders are generals leading army corps or divisions, or brigadiers or colonels.

Thus Moltke's method of war calls for boldness, self-reliance, insight into a situation, and clear understanding of the intentions of an immediate superior on the part of every leader who is a link in the chain which binds the soldier to the generalissimo. To ensure this intelligent co-operation he trained the minds of the senior officers by his criticisms at manœuvres, at staff rides and war games, to see war as he saw it. He encouraged the study of war by every means in his power. In this a potent factor was the work of the Historical section of the Great General Staff, which produced, and is still producing, a series of publications on military history and kindred subjects which are admirable expositions of war as viewed from the standpoint of the Great General Staff, and have made that point of view readily accessible to every German who cares to read. To ensure the needful energy in operations he imbued the training manuals of the army with a markedly offensive spirit, which produced that passion for attack characteristic of the army in 1866 and 1870.

Through the General Staff officers with the army corps and divisions the work was carried right down to the regiments, and

the whole corps of officers was indoctrinated with the view of the Great General Staff at Berlin. Such a task as this was not to be carried out in a day. The war of 1866, coming before it was complete, laid bare spots in the Prussian army still untouched by the labours of Moltke and his assistants—notably the cavalry and artillery commanders fell far short of what was required of them if the columns converging on an enemy were to see where they were going, and if infantry launched to attack with the necessary resolution and energy was to have its task lightened by artillery preparation and support.

The well-known incident of Prince Frederick Charles' letter to the Second Army on the evening of the 2nd of July, which showed a dangerous misunderstanding of the situation as revealed by the reconnaissance of one of his own staff officers, and the steps subsequently taken by Royal Headquarters to ensure a battle in accordance with the will of the higher command and not with that of a subordinate, disclose the fact that in 1866 the training of the minds of the subordinate commanders had not yet reached the pitch required if war on the Moltkean method was to be waged with precision and safety. However, even if all deductions are made for occasional lapses from the ideal aimed at in the training and indoctrinating of the Prussian army, Moltke was abundantly justified by the war of 1866. The victories leading up to Sadowa, battles won by detachment commanders, fitting into the mosaic of the campaign, and the great triumph of the 3rd of July on the Bistritz, are a lasting monument to the fact that in the campaign against Austria Moltke successfully harmonised in the Prussian army the three principles of command. He had a definite idea of what he wanted to do; the separate armies, and even the corps when separated from their army commander, were amenable to his intention; he possessed over the minds of his subordinate commanders a mastery sufficient to ensure that his conception should be carried out.

By 1870 further progress had been effected. The artillery had learned that it exists primarily in order to help its infantry to attack; the cavalry had acquired some idea, still rudimentary however, of the importance of reconnaissance; von der Goltz and Constantin von Alvensleben had proved at Borny and at Mars-la-Tour that subordinate commanders in the German army were fit to be entrusted with the double-edged sword of initiative, since they could appreciate situations from the point of view of Royal Headquarters. In spite of this improvement instances were not lacking, however, to

show that the indoctrinating of the subordinate commanders had not yet reached the pitch of perfection requisite to eliminate all danger from the Moltkean method of war. General Steinmetz, the Commander of the First Army, so misunderstood the *rôle* assigned to his army from the outset that he wrecked Moltke's fundamental plan of enveloping the French army on the Saar early in August by issuing orders to the First Army which brought about the unwished-for battle of Spicheren. Time after time he failed to fathom the purport of orders emanating from Royal Headquarters. The mind of Moltke was a sealed book to this veteran of seventy-one. The climax came in the famous scene during the evening of Gravelotte, when Steinmetz, with the king's permission but against the express wish of Moltke, sent in the last remaining army corps, the 2nd Corps, to make confusion worse confounded amid the mass of disorganised units which filled the Mance ravine. This was his last exploit in the field ; unity of thought between the Chief of the Great General Staff and the subordinate commanders was restored for the moment by the removal of Steinmetz from the field army. In spite of the trouble taken to form the minds of commanders, other instances of lack of mutual understanding were to be found in the German Army in 1870. In almost every instance they will be found to have occurred in the case of men who in 1857 had already attained high rank, that is to say, whose intellects had crystallized by the time they came under the influence of Moltke as Chief of the General Staff. Even a Moltke cannot mould a brain no longer receptive owing to age.

Those who now guide the destinies of the German Army were trained as young men in the school of Moltke, they are his intellectual heirs and the inheritors of his traditions ; it is therefore not surprising to find that to-day distinguished generals are eliminated from the army if they do not think in unison with the Higher Command in all that pertains to war. General von Einen, the Minister for War, defended these eliminations against criticism in the Reichstag * on the ground that if a subordinate commander does not see eye to eye with the Supreme Command, he must not be surprised if the supreme head of the army says to him, 'Since you 'are not at one with me, it is impossible for me to employ 'you.' This dictum makes it patent that among the generals of William II. no Steinmetzes will be tolerated—the lessons of Spicheren and Gravelotte have been taken to

* Dec. 21, 1904.

heart. In the Kaiser's legions unity of thought, it is clear, is held to be essential to ensuring harmony in the principles of command.

In the recent war in Manchuria the Japanese commanders, who had been imbued by Meckel with German ideas and methods, appear to have given proof of a quite remarkable unity of thought which is the fruit of common adherence to a common doctrine. We say advisedly 'appear' to have done so, because as yet the inner history of the working of the Japanese staffs has not been given to the world. So far as the present position of the literature on the Russo-Japanese War admits of a judgement being formed on this point, the conclusion would seem to be justified that one element essential to the success of the Japanese armies was a whole-hearted belief, held by officers of every rank, in the inherent soundness of the German training they had received. Problem after problem appears to have been approached from a definite and consistent German standpoint. If at Liao Yang the whole structure of Japanese strategy seemed to totter, it may be that the terrible risk accepted was due to the very nature of the doctrine with which the Japanese commanders were imbued. If in spite of this dangerous oscillation the whole edifice of the campaign did not collapse, it is assuredly because of the whole-hearted resolution and energy—a German resolution and energy, reminiscent of Mars-la-Tour—with which Japanese commanders, one and all, applied German doctrine to the problem before them, and thus ensured in their army a harmony in the principles of command which we seek for in vain in the ranks of their adversary. In the chaotic conglomeration of units which formed the Russian army in Manchuria we find no trace of a common doctrine, and we are confronted with discord in the principles of command. The Commander-in-Chief may indeed have formulated to himself some idea of how he meant to use his army, though his operations reveal no trace of confidence in himself or in his plan; but his army was not a supple instrument in his hand, it does not appear to have been controlled, or to have been controllable for the purposes of modern war.

From our brief survey of the wars we have examined it seems reasonable to conclude that doctrine has a definite place in war and in the training of an army for war. Success in war appears to be dependent upon harmony in the principles of command. That necessary harmony the unrivalled genius of Napoleon failed to ensure, because he and his subordinate leaders were not bound together by a common doctrine. That harmony Moltke in great measure did ensure in 1866 and 1870,

because he had permeated with such a doctrine the army he guided to almost unparalleled victories.

Having considered the problem from the historical point of view, and reached the conclusion that doctrine has a place in war, it will be as well to examine the position of those students of war who by a different process of reasoning have reached the opposite conclusion.

II

If we may judge the trend of thought of an army by that of its military literature, it is clear that at the present day the two leading armies of continental Europe do not think quite alike about war. In France a school of thought is to be found which expresses itself in the writings of Bonnal, Langlois, Foch (recently head of the Ecole Supérieur de Guerre), and a host of other writers who have brought to light what they claim to be the forgotten principles of Napoleonic war, and on them have built up a coherent body of teaching which is now known as the French doctrine of war.

In Germany, although the study of war has of course not been confined to the wars guided by Moltke, thought on war has been chiefly influenced by the fact that a certain method of war, in the hands of Moltke, led to success in 1866 and 1870. It is not too much to say that the leaders of present-day military thought in Germany, von der Goltz, Schlieffen, Schlichting, Caemmerer, etc., preach a doctrine which draws its direct inspiration from the campaigns of Moltke rather than from those of Napoleon, and differs profoundly from that which is taught by the group of writers who mould military thought in France. In a recent number* of this Review we compared the doctrines of the French and German schools of thought on war and noted their divergence, so there is no necessity to go over the same ground again.

In the studies of recent wars published by the Historical sections of the General Staffs of France and Germany the same divergence of teaching is to be found. The French official account of the war of 1870 is infused with what is now so well known as the French doctrine of war. In this work operations are considered from a standpoint which most certainly is not that from which the authors of the German official account of the Russo-Japanese war criticise the conduct of the operations with which they are concerned. The fact is

* The Edinburgh Review for April 1911 (No. 436).

that the General Staffs of France and Germany use official military history as an instrument to mould thought to the end that the problems of war may be viewed in the army from a consistent standpoint. A comparison of the teaching contained in the Official Histories published in Berlin and Paris respectively reveals the fact that the doctrines of the leading military writers in France and Germany harmonise with the official point of view as propounded by the men who write the Official Histories which are published by authority.

In the actual training manuals and regulations for field service of the French and German armies a certain divergence of thought on war is to be noticed, though it is not emphasised to the same degree as it is in the general body of military literature of the respective countries. The reason is not far to seek; it is to be found in Napoleon's dictum: *Les règlements sont des axes; les officiers doivent décrire la courbe.* It is this curve which differs so widely in France and Germany because of the different values assigned by the moulders of thought in those countries to the various universally accepted principles of the art of war, which are, so to speak, the co-ordinates ruling the trace of the curve which records the line of thought of an army on war.

Some students of war are content to dismiss the contention that French war differs profoundly from German war by saying that what are usually referred to as 'the French doctrine of 'war' and 'the German doctrine of war' are merely 'tendencies.' Sometimes these 'tendencies' are attributed less to incompatible conceptions of war than to the local considerations of mobilisation and geographical position which would affect the initial operations of the French and German armies. In fact it is denied that they are 'doctrines' logically derivable from the fact that in France stress is laid on certain principles of the art of war while in Germany certain other principles are accentuated. This statement, though on the surface plausible, is based on a misconception of the natures of 'doctrine' and of 'tendency.'

The correct definition of 'doctrine' is 'what is taught' or 'general body of instruction.'* This is the meaning which Colonel Foch attaches to his use of the word in his brilliant and illuminating book on war.† A 'tendency,' on the other hand, is 'a bent,' 'leaning,' or 'inclination.'‡

---

* Concise Oxford Dictionary, p. 244.

† Des Principes de la Guerre, p. 7.

‡ Concise Oxford Dictionary, p. 909.

Now a 'bent' or 'inclination' does not arise spontaneously. In connexion with the practice of any art, be it that of war or painting or architecture, it is the direct consequence of holding a reasoned belief, it is the fruit of the general body of instruction received. The fact that a tendency is to be discerned is a sure indication that behind that tendency is a definite doctrine which has called it into being. Where divergent tendencies are to be observed, it is strictly logical to assume that the doctrines of which they are the fruit are in themselves divergent. That divergence originates in the parent conceptions of war upon which the doctrines, or general bodies of instruction, are based.

If this line of reasoning be correct, the statement falls to the ground that the so-called French and German doctrines are mere 'tendencies,' and not far-reaching divergent 'doctrines,' and we may proceed to accept the conclusion of contemporary military thought on the Continent, that in very fact we have before us two definite and incompatible doctrines of war.

The suggestion that the divergence in the French and German doctrines of war is due either to the relative position of France and Germany, or to the relative degree of preparation for war in those countries, might be maintained if it could be shown that the divergence in doctrine (or tendency) existed only in the manner in which the first operations of a campaign were to be conducted. But this is not borne out by fact. An examination of the French and German doctrines, as presented on the one hand by Colonel Foch, and on the other by General von Caemmerer, shows that throughout the whole course of a campaign the exponents of each school of thought maintain an outlook on war which in many essentials is radically different.

The fact is that the French and German doctrines of war are real, and are different. By no juggle with words, such as the substitution of 'tendency' for 'doctrine,' can this essential divergence be toned down. And though at first sight it might seem to be labour wasted to confute the contention that 'doctrines,' accepted by two great armies, are merely 'tendencies,' yet in England it is necessary to meet such contentions before examining the constructive portion of the teaching of those who maintain that 'doctrines of war' are merely 'tendencies' of but little account.

The statement, which has already been dealt with, that in the French and German armies there are no 'doctrines' but only 'tendencies,' is always followed by the twofold assertion

that 'there is no such thing as a doctrine of war,' and that if there were such a thing it would be bad, and especially bad for an army, which may be called upon to operate against a great variety of enemies in various totally dissimilar theatres of war.

If it has been shown that the French and German armies hold definite and different doctrines of war, then the first of these double assertions has been dismissed. There remains for consideration the second assertion, that a doctrine of war is a bad thing, especially for the British Army.

Those who hold this view assert that in war situations are infinite in their variety: that each situation requires to be treated 'on its own merits'—a favourite phrase—and solved by the application of principles only; that adherence to a doctrine leads inevitably to adherence to a 'method,' and consequently to the attempt to find a 'normal method' applicable to the solution of an infinite variety of situations, ranging from war against Afghans in Afghanistan to war against Germans in Belgium—a fruitless search for a military philosopher's stone.

Now, is it true that in war doctrine is a bad thing? A doctrine is 'what is taught,' or 'body of instruction.'* A principle is 'a fundamental truth as a basis of reasoning.'† The principles of the art of war are the bases of reasoning about that particular art. Those principles are therefore the basis of the teaching of war; they are the raw material with which the teacher weaves the fine fabric of instruction; they are, in fact, the essential ingredients of instruction, but they are no more a general body of instruction than a heap of bricks is a house.

The principles of the art of war must be passed through a critical and constructive mind, and become a general body of instruction, before they can be of practical use, whether in the field, or in the preparation of an army for war in time of peace. That critical and constructive mind may be the mind of one man as in the case of Moltke, or it may be, and given the rarity of Moltkes it probably will more usually be, the group mind of a reflective and inquiring General Staff, adequately provided with an instrument of research in the form of a cultured and well-endowed Historical Section.

Those who maintain the proposition that a doctrine of war is desirable, as well as possible, deny that adherence to any particular doctrine leads of necessity to formalism in method.

---

* Concise Oxford Dictionary, p. 244. † Ibid. p. 655.

By 'doctrine' they understand a general body of teaching, leading those who hold it to see the concrete problems of war in the light of the general body of instruction which they hold in common. Hence, given that the *same* problem is presented to different commanders bound together by a common doctrine, *that particular problem* will appear to each commander under the same aspect, and consequently whatever solution that problem calls for will be the one which commends itself alike to each of those commanders. It most emphatically does not imply that any attempt is to be made to fit one solution to two or more essentially different problems.

We must be clear, therefore, as to what is meant by a 'problem of war,' and not confuse the 'problems of war,' which are not infinite in number, with the 'situations' which arise daily, hourly, even oftener, and may be infinite in their variety. A problem is 'a doubtful or difficult question,' a 'proposition' in which something has to be done.'* A situation, on the other hand, is 'a set of circumstances' or 'position in which one finds oneself.'†

An example will perhaps make this point clear.

At the beginning of April 1796 the French army of Italy under Bonaparte, after deducting necessary detachments, consisted of some 40,000 men available for active operations, which might be either defensive or offensive. Its opponents were the allied Austro-Piedmontese armies, of which 30,000 Austrians under Beaulieu were in the Lomellina, with advanced posts at Dego and the Bochetta pass, while under Colli there were 25,000 Piedmontese and 5000 Austrians about Mondovi, Ceva and Milesimo. Beaulieu's army was based on Lombardy, that of Colli on Piedmont. The theatre of operations was mountainous, the roads few, and the lateral communications between the two groups of allies were bad. If the French commander decided to await attack it would be possible for the allies to unite against him a force fifty per cent. stronger than his own army, a superiority of numbers which would probably ensure his defeat. The problem contained in the situation in the early days of April, before any move had been made, was how to defeat the allied armies before they could unite. On the 10th of April Beaulieu advanced his left wing. This move naturally altered the situation, but it left untouched the problem which Bonaparte had to solve. The solution which commended itself to him was to contain one ally with

* Concise Oxford Dictionary, p. 657. † Ibid. p. 812.

a detachment, while overwhelming the other by a concentration of superior force against him.

At the beginning of June 1815 the French army under Napoleon consisted of about 124,000 men available for active operations, which might be defensive or offensive. Its opponents were the allied armies under Wellington and Blücher. Wellington had about 100,000 men in cantonments between Ghent, Ath, Brussels, and Mons. Blücher's army, 120,000 strong, was in cantonments at Charleroi, Namur, Ciney and Liège. Wellington's communications ran to the north-west, those of Blücher to the east. The theatre of operations was not mountainous, the roads were numerous, and the lateral communications between the two groups of allies were good. The situations in April 1796 and June 1815 differed in the effectives of the armies engaged, the characters of the allied commanders, and the nature of the theatre of operations. Yet the problem which Napoleon had to solve in 1815 was the same problem he had been confronted with in 1796—viz. how to defeat opponents whose armies, if allowed to unite, would outnumber him. The doctrine which inspired the General Bonaparte of 1796 was the same doctrine which inspired the Emperor of 1815—in two separate situations he recognised the unity of the problem to be solved—it is not surprising to find that the solution adopted in 1815 was that of 1796.

Let us now examine the contention that 'each situation 'requires to be treated on its own merits and solved by the 'application of principles only,' and endeavour to ascertain its probable effect on the training of an army for war.

The statement is in itself a definite and complete doctrine —the '*doctrine of no doctrine.*' It is a doctrine which is the logical consequence of the conception of war as a 'business,' and the denial that it is an 'art,' as it was held to be by Napoleon and Moltke and other men who have attained some eminence in its practice. The 'doctrine of no doctrine' follows directly from an empirical conception of war. It involves the consequence that the training of an army is to stop short of any attempt to train the minds of commanders. They are to be perfected in the technique of command, but obviously any attempt to mould their mentality is to be deprecated as tending to give the mind a bent, inclination, or bias which may prejudice it in examining, 'on their own merits,' the infinite variety of situations which war presents for consideration and action.

The theory is alluring in its simplicity. It makes a special

appeal to those who base their attack on the training of the mind, on a confusion of 'doctrine' sometimes with 'method' and sometimes with 'dogma,' and who are always ready to assume that he who holds the contrary opinion is a 'doc-'trinaire.' Among its votaries are always to be found those soldiers who hold to the opinion that personal experience of war is worth more than the study of war—an opinion they share with the veteran officers of Sadowa and Sedan who despised Moltke, the schoolmaster, and his army, so poor in actual war experience compared with the armies of Austria and France.

The theory is based on a fallacy—that it is indeed possible to take unbiassed action consequent on the consideration of a situation on its own merits.

A situation is the sum of several factors—the strength, position, condition of the respective forces in presence; the intention of the hostile commander, his ability and his determination; the topographical conditions, etc.

Action is consequent on a decision which follows from these several factors producing certain definite impressions upon the mind of the commander called upon to decide. Decision, therefore, is the product of the situation and the mind of the commander. But the mind of the commander, unless he is so ignorant that it is a blank, is a critical and creative instrument, which has been formed and tempered by his own personal experience in war and in the training of troops, and by the experience communicated to him by the training he himself has received in the past from his superiors, and the books, whether of military history or of theory, in which he has studied the art of war. By no possibility can the mind of a commander be so untinged by past experience and study that the situation before him is appreciated solely on its own merits, and appears to him like some iceberg, lonely and motionless on a sea unruffled by any breath of doctrine.

Of course the adherents of the 'doctrine of no doctrine' do not mean to push their theory to this extreme. All they ask is that no attempt shall be made, by those whose duty it is to train our army for war, to give to the minds of commanders any definite bent, such as is the inevitable consequence of teaching any formulated doctrine of war, or definite and coherent body of teaching about war. They cannot, and do not desire, to prevent officers studying war. But no man can study war, any more than he can study any other art, without his mind, consciously or unconsciously, receiving a definite impression. If the study is individual and unguided—is, in fact, unrelated to

some general body of instruction—this will result in the minds of different commanders receiving impressions varying according to the course of study followed by the individual and the teacher he himself has chosen in default of guidance by superior authority. Instead of a General Staff doctrine, held in common with comrades and chiefs, each commander will have his own doctrine, entailing certain easily ascertainable consequences which are worth following up in some concrete case. As an illustration let us assume that an army of three divisions, which we will call 'A.' is operating against an army of equal size, which we will call 'B.' Army 'A' is innocent of any General Staff doctrine, whereas in army 'B' a General Staff doctrine is held in common by the Commander-in-chief and his subordinate generals. In short, that in one army intellectual anarchy prevails, while the other is in a condition of intellectual order. In army 'A' the following rather absurd situation might quite well arise :— The Commander-in-Chief may hold 'the doctrine of no 'doctrine.' The commander of his first division may pride himself on his 'common-sense,' his gift of leadership, and his contempt of theory; that of the second division may have been led by his study of war to think as a French general thinks; the third may adhere to the school of Schlichting and Count Schlieffen, and be a thoroughgoing Neo-Moltkean.

The Commander-in-Chief desires to carry out a certain operation, to which end he issues an 'operation order.' The first or 'information' paragraph of this order is a concise summary of what is known of the position and movements of the various hostile army corps, etc.; it is, in fact, a précis of the situation. The second or 'intention' paragraph is that which conveys the mind of the Commander-in-Chief to the minds of the subordinate commanders. In this paragraph the Commander-in-Chief tells his subordinates what it is he wants to do. Then follows the paragraph containing the various 'orders to troops' which are necessary in order to carry out the Commander-in-Chief's intention.

Now, in an army bound together by a common doctrine, to every subordinate commander reading an operation order each paragraph follows in logical sequence, because he understands the train of thought to which the information paragraph has given rise. 'The information being so-and-so, 'naturally the C.-in-C. wishes to do this, therefore my division 'must do that' is what a subordinate who is in intellectual sympathy with his chief's line of thought will feel instinctively in an army which is infused with a common doctrine: obedience at once becomes intelligent because the

purpose of the superior is understood, and *quite unconsciously* approved.

Now, in the case of the army 'A' we have imagined, the commander of either the second division *or* of the third division will fail to see that the 'intention' paragraph follows logically from the 'information' paragraph in General Operation Orders. In consequence of this lack of intellectual sympathy with his chief's train of thought he will find it hard to comply with the *spirit* rather than the *letter* of the order should some unforeseen modification of the situation call for such action on his part.

The commander of the first division may or may not see eye to eye with his chief, his co-operation depends largely on the simplicity or otherwise of the situation unfolded in the information paragraph: it cannot be depended upon where much intellectual effort is involved.

It can hardly be denied that the mastery of the Commander-in-Chief over the minds of his subordinate commanders will be more perfect in the homogeneous army 'B,' and that in that army will be found an intelligent co-operation lacking in army 'A'—if it is trained on the 'doctrine of no doctrine.' In short, adherence to the 'doctrine of no doctrine' intensifies the difficulty of transferring the mind of the commander to the minds of his subordinates, a difficulty which it is the object of all training and teaching to overcome.

But this aggravation of the difficulty of command is not the only drawback inherent in the 'doctrine of no doctrine.' Most problems in war contain one unknown factor, the mind of the hostile commander, which is x in the equation presenting itself for solution. It is his ability to solve this equation, the first step to overcoming the free will of his adversary and to imposing upon that adversary his own will, which differentiates the great commander from *le bon général ordinaire*. The 'doctrine of no doctrine' imports into the problem fresh unknown factors—viz. the unknown minds of subordinate commanders. If these have not been given a definite bent, known to and shared by their chief, he cannot determine with any precision how they will act when not under his immediate control, and he may find it difficult to estimate what value to attach to their appreciations of situations which they are confronted with, yet on these very appreciations his own decisions may have to be based.

Into an equation which already contains x the 'doctrine of no doctrine' introduces an unnecessary y or z in substitution for the known a or b of a common doctrine

guiding minds in a known direction. This hardly makes for simplicity in command.

We hear much nowadays about the importance of encouraging initiative in subordinate commanders. We are told that the character of modern war is such that the best results can only be obtained in an army where subordinates can be trusted to show resourcefulness, self-reliance, and readiness to assume responsibility in furthering the plan of their commander in the manifold situations which arise and demand prompt action before a perhaps distant chief can be consulted or appealed to for guidance. If this is true, it is equally true that initiative is a double-edged weapon, dangerous to trust in the hands of subordinates who are liable to misconceive the mind of the chief and are unable to read a situation as he would read it. The keen sword of initiative has no place in the armoury of those who hold the 'doctrine of no doctrine.'

And lastly there remains for consideration the argument that the tasks which may be laid upon our own army are so various, and entail operations in such diverse theatres of war, that no one doctrine (other than the 'doctrine of no doctrine') can be evolved which will meet every possible case. This argument rests on the assumptions, first, that 'doctrine' and 'method' are interchangeable terms, which we have shown to be untrue, and, secondly, that all our possible enemies are equally dangerous.

The opponents of doctrine have failed to prove that a general body of instruction which will fit an army to meet one enemy will unfit it to meet another opponent; but for the sake of argument let us assume the correctness of their allegations—that the body of teaching which may help us to overcome a Continental army in a European country will not assist us in a war with Afghans in Afghanistan. Does this, even if true, really matter? If by chance we are beaten in Afghanistan by a semi-savage enemy, it is only a matter of time, organisation, and greater effort before we put into the field a force so powerful as to be certain of overcoming the resistance of any uncivilised foe. If the British Army is beaten by a Continental army in Europe, be it in Belgium or in Norfolk, the defeat will be decisive.

The consequences of defeat by our most dangerous adversary can in no way be compared to those which ensue from ill success in any small war. In training an army for war, the greater either includes the less or excludes it; it is midsummer madness to admit the principle that the less should govern the greater. It is for this reason that our General Staff is

endeavouring to train the British Army so as to enable it to meet, with reasonable chances of success, an approximately equal number of the best troops now under arms in Europe, in whatever theatre of war those troops are likely to be encountered.

So far from admitting the contentions of those who deprecate any teaching so consistent and so far reaching as to give to the minds of those who experience it a definite bent in some desired direction, we hold that the conditions under which our army serves in peace and is trained for war make it of all European armies that one which is most in need of a clear and consistent doctrine.

The task of training the great armies of the Continent is child's play compared with the severe and intricate problem which is imposed upon our General Staff by the geographical distribution of the units which compose the British Army. True the Expeditionary Force and the Territorial Army—those fractions of our Imperial forces which will first have to bear the shock of collision with a European foe—are quartered in the British Isles under conditions of training not unlike those of their probable adversary. But, unlike a Continental army, their commanders of all ranks, superior or subordinate, are drawn from all the world, and have received their training, at a time when the mind is receptive, in units scattered from Malta to Peshawar, from the Curragh to the Cape. That the task of ensuring unity of effort from men trained under such diverse conditions is insuperable unless their minds are guided and bent in some one definite direction by the assimilation of a common doctrine is recognised by the General Staff.

For those who have eyes to see, and who will read 'Field 'Service Regulations, 1909,' in conjunction with 'Infantry 'Training, 1911'—the latest pronouncement of the General Staff, published only in September—it will be apparent that step by step, slowly but surely, the General Staff is endeavouring to guide our army along the only road which leads to unity of effort in war and harmony in the principles of command. 'Field Ser-'vice Regulations' is imbued with the offensive spirit, yet it tempers that spirit by a wise advocacy of postponement of decisive attack until the defender has been marked down, fixed and exhausted by the action of a portion of the attacking army. The sections dealing with the defence are the logical counterpart of those which treat of the attack: success is to be sought in the decisive counter-attack: the defensive is regarded as a method of creating opportunity for offensive action. In section 102 (3) of 'Field Service Regulations' a different

method of war is described, but in the succeeding paragraph it is clearly stated that that alternative method is considered unsuitable to the circumstances of our army. The teaching on the attack in 'Infantry Training, 1911,' is the same as that in 'Field Service Regulations.' In this book, issued two years after 'Field Service Regulations,' there is no advocacy of that alternative method of battle which is mentioned in 'Field Service Regulations' only to be discarded. Similarly, in the sections of 'Infantry Training,' dealing with the defence, the teaching is in accordance with that contained in 'Field 'Service Regulations,' though in some respects the teaching is amplified. The 'Memorandum on Army Training, 1910,' * gave rise to a suspicion that the General Staff was a little uncertain as to doctrine, that it might even be flirting with 'the doctrine of no doctrine,' in that it appeared to be departing from the teaching presented to the army in 'Field Service 'Regulations.' The recent publication of 'Infantry Training, '1911,' with its consistent doctrine in harmony with that of 'Field Service Regulations, 1909,' will dispel this erroneous belief by proving to the army that what the General Staff thought in 1909 it still thinks in 1911: in short that the General Staff has begun to formulate a doctrine of war.

This in itself is a great gain, but it is not enough. The army must be permeated through and through with the teaching of the General Staff. As a first step it is desirable that our officers should be dissuaded from burning incense to foreign idols, or before the meretricious shrine which encloses the tables of that negative law—'the doctrine of no doctrine.'

In no modern army is the General Staff content with presenting principles embodied in small books of regulations and training manuals. Such condensed works do but contain the grammar of the art and are but the essential basis of further instruction which takes the form of criticisms of training and manœuvres, essays in the General Staff periodicals, and above all in the analytical studies of campaigns which are prepared by their Historical Sections. In Germany one consistent doctrine animates the 'Exerzier Reglement,' the Kaiser's addresses to his generals, and the official account of the Manchurian War—it is the legacy of Moltke to the army he taught, inspired, and guided to victory.

Can we afford to do less and continue any longer to neglect the use of History as a means of teaching English War?

---

* Memorandum on Army Training, 1910, p. 5.

Art. II.—THE ELIZABETHAN PLAYWRIGHT.

1. *Elizabethan Drama.* By F. C. Schelling. 2 vols. London: Constable and Co. 1908.
2. *The Cambridge History of English Literature.* Edited by A. W. Ward and A. R. Waller. Vols. v. and vi. Cambridge: The University Press. 1910.
3. *Chronicle History of the English Stage.* By F. H. Fleay. London: Reeves and Turner. 1890.
4. *Henslowe's Diary.* By W. W. Greg. 2 vols. London: Bullen. 1904–8.
5. *Henslowe's Papers.* By W. W. Greg. London: Bullen. 1907.

At the present moment, when our current literature is marked by a feverish desire to be original (sure to defeat itself), and a determination to see, whenever possible, 'the other side' of good and bad, it is not to be expected that Shakespeare's reputation should escape assault. Apart from the frenzies of the 'Baconians,' who attack not so much Shakespeare the poet as a man Shakespeare of their own invention, it is easy to read in many a serious critic, biographer, student, of the greatest of dramatists, a wish at least to disparage him somewhat. It is not so strong as it was with a large body of the poets, critics, &c. of the eighteenth century, Pope and Johnson at their head. But it is in marked contrast to the tone—perhaps too near idolatry—often adopted by Coleridge and Lamb and their circle. That temper is indeed still to be found in *one* writer who has only just left us, Swinburne. He was not modern enough. It is in younger men than he that we find a desire if no more to harp on Pope's theory that 'gold not glory' winged Shakespeare's flights. Is it with no such underthought, only from personal idiosyncrasy, that, in his 'Life of Shake-'speare,' Sir Sidney Lee brings the financial side of the poet's career into such quaint prominence? At all events there can be no mistaking that accomplished scholar M. Jusserand's meaning, when, in an article entitled 'Ben Jonson on the Art 'of Shakespeare,' he continually holds up Jonson as the type of a conscientious artist, Shakespeare as the reverse, and writes of the latter thus:

'He praises by the mouth of Hamlet a regular tragedy of the sort which, as it is caviare to the general, he will never write. . . .

He is as full of kind attention to his audience as Jonson is ready with taunts, threats, and contumely. Thus it is that, while writing plays of this sort, Shakespeare jeers at plays where a jig or a tale of bawdry is introduced to keep the silly from sleeping, and where everybody dies at the end, clowns interrupt by their follies the most serious speeches, and surprising adventures are superabundant. He agrees with Jonson that the censure of the judicious "must outweigh a whole theatre of others." Such are—in theory—his theories. But

'La foi qui n'agit point est-ce une foi sincère?'

which means that Jonson's art, in both theory and practice, was more fit to gain the approval of the judicious than was Shakespeare's.*

Between responsible writers like these and Mr. Bernard Shaw's declaration, once made, perhaps repented of to-day, that he should like to dig up Shakespeare's bones, and stone them as a punishment for the man's want of art, we find in contemporary literature continual hints, assertions, suggestions, now in sorrow now in admiration, that Shakespeare was a sort of glorified journalist, concerned chiefly with what his public wanted, and ready to fill the want in superior shape and quantity.

Meantime, the ghost of the dramatist, could he be summoned to answer for himself, might be content, not without scorn, to point at the eternal flow of comment on his work, and that of his brother Elizabethans. For Elizabethan drama still interests and will always interest the world for the sake of its greatest exponent. In one of his dialogues between a Believer and an Agnostic, Mr. Mallock makes the former say to his opponent: 'You deny the reality of religion: but you cannot escape 'from it. It haunts you.' So it is with Shakespeare and his detractors. It is generally the very exclusiveness of their view of him that arms them with their weapons of attack; did they know him as one of a great company, they would understand that the darts they use are blunted and valueless. This is especially the case with the 'Baconians.' Their very lunacies depend on their knowing Shakespeare and Shakespeare only. As Matthew Arnold used to say that the folk who know only their Bible do not know their Bible, so is it with Shakespeare. Professor Schelling says with perfect truth†: 'A 'peculiar danger attends the study of the Elizabethan age

* 'Stratford Town' Shakespeare. Last volume. The writer on Ben Jonson in the 'Cambridge History of English Literature' (vol. vi.) seems in a hesitating way to take the same view.

† Elizabethan Drama, vol. i. p. 143.

' viewed through the lenses of Shakespearean criticism.' It is, then, not before ' Shakespeareans ' only, but before all students of Elizabethan literature that this pitfall yawns. The great Presence is so dazzling that they cannot easily discern what stands beside and distinct from it. All this, as we have said, might the ghost of Shakespeare not unscornfully point out.

It is not in the hope or intention of eliminating Shakespeare from the canvas (if that were Professor Schelling's counsel of perfection) that we propose to draw some picture of the Elizabethan playwright in the general ; for our thoughts must in the end return to him. But we can postpone the painting in of his figure. Much has been written upon the Elizabethan drama as a whole, as a product, one may say : much, more than enough perhaps, upon the technical side of it, the form of its theatres, their size, content, scenery, and the takings at their doors. Much less has been said of the more important element in production, the mind of the creator and its training, his circumstances, his inspirations. These, necessarily dealt with more or less in individual biographies, in a general sense are rarely spoken of or passed over slightingly. This is in accordance with the usual habit of critics to treat of literature in its finished shape, and rather as a manufactured article than as an organic product. We know, of course, no more of the lives of most of Shakespeare's brother-dramatists than we know of his life. But we know enough of the position and surroundings of the Elizabethan playwright as a type to understand the workings of his mind on many important matters, just those which, misunderstood, lead to absurd misconceptions concerning Shakespeare himself.

In essentials the Elizabethan playwright was a new being in a new world. The tracing of origins is always an attractive occupation : and the materials for such an one are, in the case of the Elizabethan drama, not wanting. But we must not be led astray by mere antiquarianism. Neither the ' Morality ' nor the ' Interlude,' nor yet the school or academic play has any vital connexion with the new drama, the drama of the true Elizabethan dramatist, which arose in obedience to a new impulse, a new demand, a craving for a new kind of literature among the lovers of literature. We notice for a moment these expressions, ' new impulse,' ' new demand,' ' new craving ' ; lest they be taken to countenance the journalistic creed that all literature is a matter of demand and supply. That the public for whom the Elizabethan drama was written knew what it wanted before it got it, is not to be believed : it is enough that it recognised and appreciated the created thing

when there. Nor did the creators themselves know fully what they wished to fashion: the kingdom of the imagination 'cometh not with observation.' This alone they knew, that what their genius required of them was something more significant, greater in every way than the *pastiches* of Seneca or of Plautus, which made up the university play. So that the new drama was not much inspired on that side. On the other hand, it was completely secular. We need to know but a little of the medieval drama, we have only to read some of the miracle plays and the moralities of the preceding age, and to contrast these with the world of the Reformation and the new learning, to understand how narrow was the outlook of the first, how urgent for something wider must have been the demand of the second. Again, the new drama could never have taken the town, or appealed even to a half-awakened literary instinct in the audience, if the hearts of the dramatists had not been in their work in a manner much more real than could be that of a schoolmaster Udall turning Plautus to the needs of modern life in 'Ralph Roister Doister,' or even of the 'cultured' authors of 'Gorboduc.' There are, without doubt, fine lines in 'Gorboduc.'* Knowing the 'realism' of Shakespeare's imagination, one can have little doubt that the rhetorical passage which the player recites to Hamlet, and which was 'caviare to the general,' was imagined by our poet to come from a play of that type. And there was place too in the new comedy for Plautine imitations—such as is the 'Comedy of 'Errors.' But the spirit which lies in the 'Comedy of Errors' is a world apart from that which animates Master Udall; nor has the secret of Elizabethan drama been in any wise revealed to the authors of 'Ferrex and Porrex.'

How shall we name this secret? For one thing we have to note that it was as much lost to the successors of the true Elizabethans as still unrevealed to Norton and Sackville when they wrote their tragedy. For it is the case that, though almost every poet of distinction since Shakespeare, from Dryden to Swinburne (or later if you will), has tried to write the Shakespearean play, they have all failed, where even lesser Elizabethans such as Thomas Heywood succeeded: they have all failed in the true marriage of speech and action. With them (somehow) the action seems to stop short when the speechifying begins; and, when action goes forth swiftly and naturally, the talking sounds forced and unreal. It seems a poor attempt at explanation to say that the hearts of these

* Otherwise 'Ferrex and Porrex.'

Elizabethans were in their work, as the hearts of their successors could not be; and yet, rightly considered and clarified a little by expansion, this explains the difference between the two orders of drama, and answers the question at the head of this paragraph. The writer of the 'Interlude' was a mere supplementer, a sort of understrapper; the Elizabethan playwright was something very different from that. The writer of the school play was an amateur; the Elizabethan playwright was anything but that: his work at the outset had often very grim results for him. The writer of the 'Miracle Play' had been enough in earnest—once. But his age of religiosity was far behind; between him and the new learning had intervened a period of convention, and in neither the earnestness nor the convention of that art has the new dramatist any share. Yet, whether he knew it or not (and if his every-day consciousness recked nothing of it, his better self, his Genius knew it), the Elizabethan playwright was taking a part in the creation of the greatest drama since the Attic theatre decayed. A dæmonic force was upon him—which his Genius knew—compelling him to write; compelling how many others his contemporaries to join the sorrowful band of playwrights! Within a decade of the inauguration (by Kyd and Lyly?) of the true Elizabethan drama in tragedy and comedy—by Kyd and Lyly, as it seems, but with the greater Peele, Greene, Marlowe, treading so close upon their heels as to gall their kibes—almost everyone with education and literary tastes found himself a-writing of plays. Every young man from the universities, it has been said, had a play in his box. An exaggeration, no doubt: but much nearer the truth than the imagination of the average layman, who sees Shakespeare occupying the stage almost alone—at least between the death of Marlowe and the rise of Jonson, of Beaumont, and of Fletcher; and afterwards with none but these and a few more notable rivals. This is the imagination of the average man; and the wonder of Shakespeare's indifference to the preservation of his own work becomes a miracle. But what are the facts? Professor Schelling, at the end of his 'Elizabethan Drama,' gives a list of the plays and productions of a dramatic character which saw the light between 1588 and 1642.* They fill eighty-six pages, of something like twenty-two works to the page. That would give an average of thirty-five per annum—though by no means all in Schelling's list were plays put on the London boards. Malone, again (it is said),

* I.e., the date of the closing of the theatres in London by order of Parliament.

calculated that 2000 plays were *acted* between the accession of Elizabeth and the closing of the theatres (1642). The plays performed during the first twenty years of the Queen's reign were an insignificant number,* beside those which distinguished her closing years and the reign of James. Toward the beginning of the troubles the number of dramas again fell off. So that for the fat years of drama in England this calculation would certainly give us more than thirty a year. And of course there were revivals. When we turn to the record of individual playwrights evidence is of the same kind. Thomas Heywood's claim to have had 'an entire hand or at least a maine finger' in 220 plays is well known.† Even such an insignificant man as John Day, about Shakespeare's contemporary, but whose birth and death dates are unknown, a writer in fact hardly known save to students of Elizabethan literature, has twenty-seven plays in whole or part to his name—twenty-seven accepted and acted, that is to say. So that Shakespeare's thirty-six acknowledged plays, which seem to make such a tremendous achievement for his twenty years or so of work (and are tremendous of course in the ranks of poetry), in the rank of arithmetic make but an average production: and his production during his vigorous years of two dramas a year is swallowed up in the total number played to the town—some thirty odd beside revivals. Reckoned as poetry, measured against that of other poets, Shakespeare's work, in quantity alone, is very large. Milton has left us not twenty thousand lines; Shelley rather more; Wordsworth, most persevering of writers, some fifty thousand; Coleridge, most indolent of poets, not ten thousand.‡ Now Shakespeare wrote more than fifty thousand lines of blank verse, with his poems quite sixty thousand verses in all. Reckoned, however, as drama his work was less than that of many of his contemporaries.

This distinction is of supreme importance. It helps to solve for us the difficulty which we met with just now, that in the hands of post-Elizabethan poets the Shakespearean (which is the

* The first public theatre was built in 1576, anno regni 18–19. Peele's 'Arraignment of Paris' appeared in 1581.

† English Traveller: Letter to the Reader. J. A. Symonds says of him, 'Heywood seems to have worked tolerably free from joint composition' (Introd. to plays in 'Mermaid Series,' p. viii). No doubt Heywood's life was much longer than Shakespeare's (over seventy to the other's fifty-two). But then Heywood wrote an enormous number of undramatic works (in verse and prose), more by many than Shakespeare's.

‡ Of original verse.

Elizabethan) play is always essentially a failure. If we examine the failures one by one, we almost always find the same thing—the fault we noted, that the poetry will not fit in with the action; that, as was said, the characters either stop to declaim, or, while in action, their speech is rhetorical and forced or else prosy. The reason of the difference in the two orders of drama is, we are convinced, this: that with the Elizabethan dramatist (as a class) the poetry comes unsought, a fairy gift, which was distilled like manna-dew from the atmosphere of his life. For—and this should never be forgotten—plays were not reckoned 'of poetry' then; they were at the outset hardly even accounted 'of literature.' A strange paradox that the greatest of all the products of the world-filling English race should be accounted at the time of its production scarcely worth the attention of grave men—of the typical 'man of 'culture' in that age, steeped in classical tradition! What a contrast in this is there between the Attic drama and ours! But in England it has almost always been so with the arts, and most with poetry; where all great work of this sort comes as the kingdom of heaven, like a thief in the night. 'England, 'the mother of excellent minds, hath too often been a hard 'step-mother to poetry.'* These two factors are specially to be reckoned with in the making of the Elizabethan playwright, a nameless dæmonic impulse to write drama, which his 'super-'liminal' self could perhaps hardly understand, and the circumstance that for all his inspiration he was scarcely entitled to reckon himself 'of literature,' nor claim for his work from cultured persons more than a passing and condescending notice. This holds at the outset, and for the time to which the formation of Shakespeare's genius belongs: the chief author of a change in the attitude of the upper classes toward the play was Ben Jonson. His learning armed him for the cause. While he was never popular with the regular theatre-goers, he brought all the learned and superior people over to his side. The fact that he was a fighter, and conscious of the conflict necessary to change the status of the dramatist, explains what seems to us the stupidest part of his work—the eternal explanations, citations, 'pièces justificatives' which accompany Ben Jonson's plays, either (when printed) frankly as notes, or uttered by the mouth of the 'Grex,' the chorus. To Jonson, first among dramatists, the printed and published play is an important thing: he, as Cowley said, named his 'works' what others had called their 'plays': an act of

* Sidney.

vanity and presumption many of his contemporaries doubtless reckoned it.* That at least now seems sensible enough ; to us the opposite is incredible. Shakespeare's seeming indifference on this head is more than all else responsible for the mythology which has grown up about him. It affects the judgment of such an accomplished writer as M. Jusserand, as will appear clearly to anyone reading through the essay from which we lately gave an extract. Yet if this was so strange in Shakespeare, at least all the early dramatists were in tale. It was marvellous, supremely magnanimous, supremely foolish, as we choose to regard it : but Shakespeare's seeming indifference to his production is much less than Heywood's, who does not even specify the plays in which he took the greatest part. He says they were 220 in number : less than thirty of them can now be identified. To Charles Lamb such an attitude seems noble :

> ' What a slender pittance of fame was motive sufficient for the production of such plays as " The English Traveller," " The " Challenge for Beauty," and the " Woman Killed with Kindness." Posterity is bound to take care that a writer loses nothing by such a noble modesty,'

he writes in his ' Specimens ' : and we think it will seem noble to most. But in Shakespeare the risk (maybe the loss) was too tremendous. We cannot in such a case give a like indulgence : what with the lesser man seems grandeur, in him seems folly. And, steeped as we are in literature, thinking always ' in terms of ' the printed page (greedy too of fame, or notoriety at least, in proportion it may be to the smallness of our desert : but that is another matter), the attitude of any one of these Elizabethans towards their work is not for us realisable nor reasonable. But they could not think in our wise. For them the play itself was the thing, and it was a thing not ' of literature ' as we have just noted.† They must of necessity think ' in terms of ' not the

---

* Cf. Heywood, *l.c.*

† This is, of course, nearly always (verbally) recognised by students of Elizabethan drama, as by J. A. Symonds in the Preface to Heywood's plays quoted above (p. x). But even such writers continually speak as if they forgot it or did not understand all that it implies. So M. Jusserand in the article from which we have quoted.

At the moment of our writing this essay there appears a very interesting book by Mr. Percy Simpson on ' Shakespearean Punctuation ' (Clarendon Press) which very well illustrates and enforces the point which we are making here. By modern editors of Shakespeare the punctuation of the first folio has been entirely thrust

printed book, but the performance. Not very differently from them might think a composer, even in our day; perhaps the better sort of composers do think in that fashion, that is in terms of the performance not of the score. The composer knows of course that, if his work is to live, it must live through the published score not otherwise. Yet one can easily imagine him not able to care for that side of the business: unable to think of it save as the piece played in the concert-room or on the

---

aside. It is, in fact, judged by our modern *grammatical* system of punctuation, quite indefensible. But Mr. Simpson successfully argues that, from the point of view not of grammar but of elocution, it is right and sensible. The utter neglect by modern editors of the consideration which was naturally foremost in the minds of the editors of the folio, is a very good example of our changed standpoint from the truly dramatic to the literary reading of Shakespeare. It is one more example of how nearly impossible it is for us to realise a time when men thought and could think only of the drama in its *presented* form.

To show the difference between the two methods of punctuation let us take a passage from Macbeth's first soliloquy, before the murder: (1) as modernly punctuated; (2) in the stopping of the folio. The first is from the Cambridge Shakespeare.

> 'If it were done when 'tis done, then 'twere well
> It were done quickly: if the assassination
> Could trammel up the consequence, and catch,
> With his surcease, success; that but this blow
> Might be the be-all and the end-all here,
> But here, upon this bank and shoal of time,
> We'ld jump the life to come.'

But the folio has a much heavier stopping to indicate the pauses of Macbeth's thought:

> 'If it were done, when 'tis done, then 'twere well
> It were done quickly: if the Assassination
> Could trammel up the consequence, and catch
> With his surcease, success: that but this blow
> Might be the be-all and the end-all. Here,
> But here, upon this Bank and Shoal of time
> We'ld jump the life to come.'

There are a hundred instances besides where the folio stopping, absurd judged by our modern use, is as a guide to the speaker, perfectly reasonable.

Now, what do these things show? Not alone that the editors of the folio had the spoken play and none other in their minds, but that they were very careful to leave directions *how* the speeches should be given, deeming (as was natural for them) that that was the be-all and the end-all of drama.

opera stage. And, as you cannot by reason put limits to the cravings, nor yet to the satisfaction of genius, it is not difficult to see with the eye of a great composer, for whom the certainty of performance the ' here and now ' would be the all in all—that and the repetitions on which he could also count: so that while at work he would think ' in terms of ' these things, think so intensely and earnestly (for that is the way of genius), that his mind could not turn to the more prosaic details of printing and publishing. For the creative impulse hath a compelling force of its own, which obliges a man to think almost exclusively of the thing he is engaged in creating. In the case of a poet it is the poem itself: for the composer it is the harmony of sounds which musical instruments in a definite place will create; for the dramatist it is the performance ' in ' time and space ' of his drama. It will not be during his hour of inspiration that the poet will see to the preservation of the ' butcher's book ' in which his lines may have been scribbled, or the composer or dramatist take most thought for printing and publication. The force itself of the creative power brings its own reaction; and it is perhaps because we are not to-day overwhelmed with that divine breath, that we have so much mind left over for the business side of our work. This is a reasonable and natural explanation of the indifference of Shakespeare to the future of his manuscripts, which has puzzled so many.

It must be confessed that the position of the dramatist, at that moment quite unique, has never been approached since, so that it is no great wonder if critics of a later age have misunderstood it. Never since has the stage held a very important place in the intellectual life of the nation; and at the very moment when its importance was supreme it was (by the critics who spoke to posterity) least recognised. Thus it was that in direct opposition stood the compelling force which drove men to play-writing, and the misesteem of their production coming precisely from the fact that it was unique. There was not so much precedent for it as even for Malvolio's supposed good fortunes. We have but to take account of the difference between the Elizabethan estimate of Spenser and the Elizabethan estimate of Shakespeare, to begin to understand that the drama then was not worth a very serious notice from literary men; or we have but to realise, what we shall have further occasion for commenting on, that Shakespeare's reputation among his contemporaries rested upon his poems, not upon his plays. The audience of the Elizabethan playwright were the theatre-goers and no others. How then could the

playwright think of his work as 'read,' or of anything other than the acted play? When Hamlet gives counsel to the players he includes matters which are in the province of the author rather than of the actor. That 'the end of playing, 'both at the first and now, was and is to hold as 'twere the 'mirror up to nature,' is not meant to apply, we may be sure, simply to the actor's business; the 'playing' includes the play-writing. Those among our dramatic critics and authors who are fond of the phrases 'sense of the stage,' 'sense of 'the theatre,' might, then, point to the Elizabethan playwright as in a pre-eminent position to possess that gift, and often they do so point. And they are in the right, if by the expressions 'sense of the stage,' 'sense of the theatre' they do not mean (what the critics too often do mean) only a vision of play as a definite manufactured article, and a sober imagination which never strays beyond the possibilities of the theatre. The Elizabethan's 'sense of the stage' does not preclude idealisation: no great art could live without it. *His* sense of the stage had nothing to do with the practical gift of knowing what Burbage could manage, or what best suited Hemynge's style. Prospero's magic isle is not, by his sense of the stage, realised as a mere piece of boarding. Not a whit more than by Turner, while he is painting, his landscape is realised as a square of canvas, and so much gambooge, ultramarine, and so on. But, as Turner cannot think otherwise than 'in terms 'of' paint, no more can the Elizabethan dramatist think of his drama otherwise than as a drama, he cannot think of it in terms of paper and print. The later poet, on the contrary, wishing to write a Shakespearean play, cannot really think of it but as literature, and hence his failure. The average critic thinks of all artistic produce as accomplished fact. But for the creator his 'fact' is never accomplished; it is still something better than the best that can be realised on this mortal scene. The composer composes for ideal performers, not for the special faults and qualities of this or that quartette. And if it be to lack 'a sense of the stage' to compose plays which could not be perfectly produced, and so are (after all) to the imaginative reader better as literature than in the acting, then we must confess that the Elizabethan playwright had not this gift.

The ideality which above all else marks the Elizabethan playwright, down even to him of the lower ranks, is the outcome and the correlative of the untraceable, irresistible impulse which worked upon the whole brotherhood. And it is wasted labour to speculate precisely how the impulse to dramatise

was awakened in one or the other. It was not roused by pedantry such as marks the schoolmaster playwright. For the greatness of the real dramatists lay precisely in their powers of over-riding tradition. But it was a necessity that these too should be educated men; the best among the pioneers were in fact university men. That last was an accident—not needful. In the grammar-schools of that learning-loving age the essentials of a good education could be come by. Not precisely learning, but the love of learning, the taste for literature—these are the essentials in the making of an educated man. And when we remember that Philemon Holland was but a grammar-school master, we may be sure that these things could be learned at grammar schools, even without the polishing of the universities. (Very soon, too, with its vast variety and daring achievement, the theatre itself became an education.) It is absurd to suppose either that Shakespeare was an ignoramus in book-learning, or that Marlowe, Greene, and Peele were 'scholars' as we use the term. Scholarly they may have been, but not scholars. *That* was Ben Jonson, almost alone among the dramatists for the public stage. Even so, in that other great era of English poetry the nineteenth century—which lies almost at our doors and is second only to the Elizabethan age—while Wordsworth, Byron, Shelley, Coleridge, were all university men, the last alone might be called a scholar. Keats stands outside the group, with perhaps neither Latin nor Greek; and yet he, too, had all the essentials of education, a quenchless thirst for reading, a love of the ancients, and the reverence which such love implies. It is natural that, merely as a class distinction, the 'University Wits' should have held together, and persuaded themselves that the public-school boy who came next to them was beautified with their feathers. He *did* first come to copy, if anon to outdo, them by far.

Without reverence for what has gone before, such as is implied in a love of letters, what of great literature has arisen? But what is most noteworthy in the new dramatists is their daring, or, say, the courage to trust their inspiration. Unwillingly, but of necessity, they broke with tradition, and were driven to confront the penalty of lawbreakers. Evil and endless obstruction their faith in themselves was sure to bring upon them; that aristocratic age having almost as blind a love of tradition as has our democratic one of novelty and paradox. Sidney himself, by a strange contradiction, did what in him lay to obstruct the path of those great men, and to justify his own complaint of England which we quoted a

minute ago. Writing his 'Defence of Poetry' in 1582 (?) * he marks the characteristics of the new drama and sees in them nothing but absurdities.

'Our tragedies and comedies observe,' he says, 'rules 'neither of honest civility nor skilful poetrie,' finding a partial exception in 'Gorboduc.' It is defiance of the unities which Sidney specially blames (as we should expect); and, but that the dates disallow all such thought, we might imagine him (as is supposed of Jonson in a well-known passage) to gird at 'The 'Tempest' itself. For, talking of all the varieties of place which the same stage is supposed to figure, we come to 'news 'of shipwreck; and then we are to blame if we accept it not for a 'rock. Upon the back of that comes out a hideous monster '. . . and then the miserable beholders are bound to take it 'for a cave.' A passage which next ensues might be a vague memory of 'Pericles' or 'A Winter's Tale.' But Sidney was dead before Shakespeare's star had risen into glory. And his 'Defence of Poesie,' though not published till 1595, was written much earlier. If, however, the defender of poetry could speak thus (even by anticipation) of the new drama, what might its protagonists look for from the 'poetry-whippers' as Sidney calls them, or the grave men and statesmen of that time? True, Puritanism had not yet become rampant, and among the general citizens the theatre was soon to gain abundance of support. But contempt at the hands of the leaders of thought could not be compensated by the applause of the vulgar. So we doubt not that all these beginners felt themselves to some extent under a ban. Or it may have been rather the cruel dæmonic powers within them, that forced them into such wild courses and to the persuasion that ''tis better to be vile 'than vile-esteemed.' The pioneers gained little from their labours, little for themselves, much for us. Peele, the longest-lived of the great three, lived, wild, laborious and poor, and died (horribly, 'tis said) at thirty-nine; Greene at thirty-four in poverty, disease, and spleen; Marlowe in a tavern brawl at twenty-nine. These were the greater spirits. There were two others, more sober and more fortunate, less cursed by the inspiration of the Time-Spirit, though they were, perhaps more than the other three wits, the inaugurators of the new drama. These two are Kyd and Lyly,† the one for tragedy,

* Possibly 1580. But Gosson's second pamphlet was not written till 1582; and it is especially to Gosson that Sidney is replying.

† Himself a 'university wit'; but (with Nash) not in a category with the three of whom we have spoken.

the other for comedy. For most of us to-day this honour must suffice them. Few now could find patience to read 'The 'Spanish Tragedy,' though its popularity in its own day was very great, surpassing probably that of any play of Shakespeare's.* Of Lyly's comedies the reflection in Shakespeare's earlier work is unmistakeable. They have fallen dead to us. Even Greene and Peele are not of much account; though any man may read with pleasure 'The Pinner of Wakefield' or 'David 'and Bethsabe'; and should read them with high admiration, would he but meditate on the novelty of all such work at the time it was written. †

For most of us the preternatural power which was at work in these beginners, and was anon to drive, to hurry, and compel so many educated men into the thankless task of playwriting, seems concentrated in the work of Marlowe. Whence came this power? For the writer of this essay it was a something in the atmosphere, in the life about these poets, in the very quality of life, intellectual life, which belongs to this era: the new vision of the world supervening, when the crust of out-worn medievalism had fallen off at the end of the Civil Wars; an experience much as might have been the effect to a man of putting off his helmet, and seeing things about him in their natural hues. But it would be speaking a language more likely to be understood and accepted to-day, were we to say that the new drama arose in answer to the public demand: that, while (as Sidney shows) to the aristocratic and erudite few the ancients still afforded the only type of true excellence, this theatre drew its inspiration from the fact that (for the first time) it appealed to the people at large: that it was the only form of literature independent—largely independent at least—

* The evidences for this are various. For one thing there are the many revivals of the play; in one of which and the refashioning of the 'Spanish Tragedy' Jonson took part. It suggested, too, many imitations—from mere plagiarisms to such an unlike offspring as 'Hamlet' itself. But perhaps the strongest proof the popularity of the 'Spanish Tragedy' (otherwise 'Hieronimo') lies in the story told by Prynne in his 'Histriomastix' of a woman who on her deathbed exclaimed 'O Hieronimo! If I could but see Hieronimo acted once more!': for Prynne an awful lesson.

† These early dramas are, no doubt, very much open to strictures such as Sidney's. They are even more wandering and 'unsewn' than Marlowe's. 'George-a-Greene, the Pinner of Wakefield' is peculiarly so. It must, however, be considered that dramas were all literature (all the literature they got) for a large and not unintelligent part of the audience. Such plays had, therefore, some of the characteristics of the modern novel.

of private patronage. Without question this last circumstance is a fact of weight. There had sprung up a middle class—the very class to which most of the poets and dramatists of the age belonged by birth—which was cultivated in its fashion. To it the multitudinous grammar-schools of England were open. Though only a few select spirits from this body were chosen servants of the Muses, there must have been many more, compelled by circumstances to turn to business, whose hearts were rather in literature. Yet they had neither time to spend in poring over print, nor money for the purchase of an adequate library. For many such the theatre was the all-in-all of their intellectual life. As we said above, it was soon itself an education. Thus may the reader, according to his predilections or convictions, make the controlling influence of the new drama either descend from above or mount from below. Whichever origin he chose, he cannot well quarrel with our epithet 'dæmonic' (even though he should give it a worse than Greek significance); cannot if he read again the examples of the earliest drama, read his Marlowe more especially, or summon him back to remembrance. It is certainly a wild art. How different, for example, from Chaucer's, the greatest poetry which had preceded it, written as that is with a distinct appreciation of the taste which it addresses, and, therefore, with so steady and sure a hand! And Spenser is on the whole like to his great predecessor, though with a less balanced 'artistry,' and so with a touch of Elizabethan wildness. One cannot in reading Marlowe think that he had any clear idea for whom he was writing, nor, in truth, that his auditors could have quite understood him. Nevertheless this negative fact is important: that for him, as for all the new dramatists, the patron—the individual patron—has disappeared. There is as yet no copyright: and so literature—poetry, that is, distinctly recognised as poetry—must live by individual patronage or not at all. This new drama will live, not indeed by the patronage of the multitude, for no great literature has gained the general suffrage at the outset, but by the appreciation of some unknown factors—the one or two 'judicious' present at each representation.

It is right then to turn our thoughts to the audiences in these theatres. * However much the authors wished to address themselves to the aristocratic part of their public

* The name of our 'theatres' (though of course classical) descends directly from *the* Theatre built in 1576, the first of the new playhouses. Others which followed were the Curtain (1577), the Rose

only, and thought they were doing so, it is certain that the majority of the hearers could hardly have belonged to a highly cultivated class. We see that when we reckon the great size of the theatres which began to be built in the later years of Elizabeth. Nevertheless we must not think of these audiences as like a music-hall audience to-day, despite the abuse which Shakespeare and many others heap on the 'groundlings.' There was probably a considerable difference in culture between the groundlings of the private theatres (such as Blackfriars) and of the public theatres such as the Globe. Shakespeare was (probably) freely acted at both. In the former the groundlings, for seats sheltered from the weather, paid (reckoning the altered value of money) as much as your upper-circle ticket-holder pays to-day. No frivolous pleasure would have drawn so much money from their pockets. The same class may probably have paid for places in some one of the galleries of the public theatres; where the groundlings got standing room under the open sky for a penny (= 8*d.*) a place. There were seemingly more places in the galleries taken altogether (e.g. in the Globe Theatre) than in the pit. And yet these galleries could not, night after night, have been filled by the 'upper classes.' A middle class of spectators must therefore have contributed a great share of the takings; and the takings of actors and managers in those times would make water the mouths of their successors to-day. Middleton's 'A Game of 'Chess' (acted in 1624), itself a mere pamphlet-play politico-religious, but exceedingly popular, ran for nine days in sequence (a great run for those times), and the company took (it was reported) 1500*l.* That would equal in our money 8000*l.* or 9000*l.* A thousand pounds a night, with little or no scenery—the thought (if it can be entertained) is certainly a captivating one for actor-managers of to-day. This is, of course, later than our period; but it cannot have been so different as not to serve as some criterion.*

To-day there is a growing habit with some of our writers, and good ones too, yet over-anxious to show themselves on terms with 'that poor limitary creature calling himself a man 'of the world' † of sneering at 'the suburbs,' at Brixton or

(1577), the Blackfriars Theatre (1596), the Swan in the same year, the famous Globe (1598). These for Elizabeth's reign. They were not all open simultaneously. The Theatre, for example, had come to an end before the Globe was built.

* See Schelling, Elizabethan Drama,' vol. i. p. 144.

† De Quincey.

West Kensington, sometimes even at modest and innocuous Bayswater. Who knows whether it be not precisely in Brixton or West Kensington, with their small opportunities for change or for dearer pleasures, that you will find better lovers of true literature than among those cultured persons who exchange their library books thrice a week and have unlimited literary talk ready for the dinner-table? And Shakespeare's one judicious man (though he alas! would not have allowed it) was perhaps more often present in the pit, or in the cheaper galleries, than in the boxes or on the stage, where gallants 'drank tobacco,' played cards, or chaffed the actors—sometimes in the most moving scenes. 'The wind bloweth where 'it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not 'tell whence it cometh or whither it goeth: So is every one 'that is born of the Spirit.' Whencesoever sprang the full fountain of inspiration for the playwright, whether absorbed like a mist from the audience or born of the divine greatness of the age in which he lived, this wide field over which its waters were poured was, we may be sure, necessary for the seed they quickened. What Sidney says, of which we have given an extract, concerning the drama of his day, shows that this art could not have flourished under private patronage. And the spirit of its begetters, too, could not probably have flourished under private patronage; if we may use the word 'flourished' for a fulness of life which was in a manner their undoing. The vitality of this 'movement' was in a sense the bane of the spirits moved. The immense production, the number of producers yielded up those producers an easy prey to the capitalist. Henslowe, the manager, seems an exact counterpart of the publisher, not of the present moment, but of the 'Bacon 'and Bungay' type described in 'Pendennis.' He could be (fairly) liberal; and no doubt it paid him well generally to have playwrights in his debt. What perhaps operated more favourably for the author was that the proprietors of theatres (as to-day) were at least in part actors; not single actor-managers, as with us, but very often a whole company. Usually the company had some capitalist rights in the concern. Henslowe himself was succeeded by Alleyn the actor, who seems to have been a man really generous.

And on the whole the pay for dramatic work was not so bad: generally 5*l.* a play—an indiscriminating five pounds, but then who could tell what would take with the audience? *

* If the play was a success the writer got a further sum for revising it, and possibly a 'benefit'!

And where are gone some of the pieces mentioned in Henslowe's diary? 'The Wise Man (or Men) of West Chester,' where is it now—that ran on about equal terms with 'Tamburlaine'? At all events this five pounds a play compares favourably with the five pounds paid for 'Paradise Lost,' and, as in modern money (in 1590 say), it would be equal to some 40*l.*, can we say that as an 'all-round price' novels with us bring in more? There was not then the magic power of the press and the advertising editor to distinguish between author and author. And, then, was it not in itself an audacity for this art of play-writing to expect to live, the only one, otherwise than by a patron?

All that has been written hitherto is applicable to the Elizabethan playwright in general. We have even to some extent followed the counsel of Professor Schelling and shut Shakespeare out of the picture. Yet it is impossible but that our thought, like Dante's 'pilgrim ray,' should return at the end to that luminary beside whose brilliance the best of the others 'poorly satisfy our eyes.' Side by side with the facts which we have detailed, we shall see how senseless appears most of the mythology which has clustered about Shakespeare's name. All considerations of probability will give us a Shakespeare natural and reasonable; not indeed the quite unearthly being of the early nineteenth-century critics, but still less the wooden figure which a certain modern criticism has discovered, writing wonders of poetry by mechanism, while the soul of the man himself is intent on quite other things, on indentures, conveyances, recoveries. 'Is this the fine of his fines, and 'the recovery of his recoveries?' But the getting rid of such a monster is on condition that we admit and understand the primal and essential miracle of this age, the up-spring of the Elizabethan drama.

The son of a man of the middle class, once a leading citizen but who lived to have seen better days, Shakespeare by birth was scarce by a hair's-breadth either above or below the most of his contemporaries, the playwrights and the poets.* But that his father had misfortunes, he would doubtless, like Peele or Marlowe, have gone to one of the universities: as it was, he had

* Spenser was the son of a clothmaker (though the poet claimed kinship with the Spencers of Althorp), Peele of a salter, Marlowe of a shoemaker, and Webster of a tailor. Jonson (we all know) was step-son to a bricklayer. Of Chapman, Greene, Dekker, and many others, the parentage is quite unknown; of Cyril Turnour *everything*. Beaumont and Fletcher were, of course, of very different rank. Heywood seems to have been a gentleman by birth: so was Marston.

to be content with his grammar-school education, which, as we have already said, for an *education* was sufficient; enough to give 'a love of learning,' but not that learning itself. Over one thus charged with genius no intellectual movement so great as the new theatre could pass without affecting it. The new theatre was not for London alone. On the contrary, the most famous companies, the greatest actors, were seen from time to time in the provinces. Lord Leicester's company we know to have been at Stratford in 1587—the year before Shakespeare left Stratford? So that when Shakespeare, whether urged by domestic infelicity or merely to seek his fortune, went to London, his genius, almost of itself and without the will-power of the man, must have been drawn to that loadstone rock, the stage.

Already the great pioneers had begun to unearth its treasures. *They* were doomed to perish early. The type and greatest of them, though only Shakespeare's contemporary in age, had already traversed over half of his journey. Him at least we must think of as moved by no power but his own greatness, independent altogether of his audience, creating his impossible heroes, pouring out his splendid rhetoric, almost unconscious whether the theatre before him were full or empty. Did it contain but one auditor, it would have been enough: for he was the predestined king of this kingdom.

It is part of the miracle of this drama that it grows before our eyes like the juggler's aloe. Though Shakespeare was Marlowe's contemporary in age, in art he was his pupil and imitator. The genius of the new theatre is expressed in the first three lines of the prologue to 'Tamburlaine':

> 'From jigging veins of rhyming mother-wits'—

that is, from the 'Interlude,' the only *public* theatre of the foregoing age—

> 'And such conceits as clownage keeps in pay,
> We'ld lead you to the stately tent of war.'

'The stately tent of war.' Here we have Marlowe's line already in the might of its perfection. How should the Stratford scholar be other than captured at the very outset?

> 'Whom seekst thou, Persian? I am Tamburlaine.'

Drawn by what secret love of poetry, by what rumour of great names of poets are you, Provincial, come to London? I am Marlowe. I am the New Drama, more wonderful than any wonder in the 'Fairy Queen.'

And the die is cast: the new-comer's lot is with the new

theatre. At first he is an almost slavish copyist of the master. For before anything else Shakespeare was of a docile nature. Indeed the dæmonic force, like the first ravages of a new fever, had spent the worst of its power on the three great pioneers. With Shakespeare the second era begins, a time of calmer, but far greater greatness.

So with the life of this hero of the second era. While still an actor, he had time to look about him, and, fresh from the humiliations of his father's bankruptcy and his own straitened life with Anne Hathaway, to realise how ample the pay of an actor was in those days. The dazzling ray of the new geniuses would be enough to make Shakespeare seek the stage. Even in quite modern days, great novelists, such as Thackeray and Dickens, have generally begun their town career by being stage-struck: and the influence of the stage never passed from Dickens's work. Yet the stage is really of very secondary importance in the intellectual life of to-day. How much rather then would be stage-struck an impressionable youth before the theatre of Marlowe? In *that* age there was no other form of creative literature, nothing comparable to the modern novel, able to rival the stage in its own field. Therefore once to surrender oneself to this form of creation was to surrender one's thoughts, to think (as was explained above) 'in terms of' the theatre: to dream (as we may suppose Shakespeare first dreaming) of putting on the boards an heroic being like to this 'Tamburlaine,' speaking lines as magniloquent as his

> 'Now clear the triple region of the air,
> And let the majesty of Heaven behold
> Their scourge and terror tread on emperors.
> Smile, stars that reigned at my nativity,
> And dim the brightness of your neighbour lamps,
> Disdain to borrow light of Cynthia!
> For I, the chiefest lamp of all the earth,
> Will send up fire to your turning spheres,
> And cause the sun to borrow light of you.'

Which, accordingly, the new actor-playwright (so soon as he has gained a little courage by botching up other people's plays, and writing maybe a good part of 'Arden of Feversham') tries to do in 'Titus Andronicus,' and (by the standard of his own after-achievement) accomplishes on the whole deplorably ill. What alone is noteworthy (and most affecting if you consider it rightly) in 'Titus Andronicus,' is to see how Shakespeare, though seized on by all the wildness of this new power, striving too much after the grandiose, and out-heroding Herod in blood and murder, does not quite forget the simple wood-notes of his

own Warwickshire. Thus, at one time, he speaks finely enough, in the high strain of Marlowe :

> ' As when the golden sun salutes the morn,
> And having gilt the ocean with his beams,
> Gallops the zodiac in his glistening coach,
> And overlooks the highest-peering hills,
> So Tamora.'

But at another with a voice more simple and at this period of his life much more individual :

> ' The birds chant melody on every bush ;
> The snake lies rolled in the cheerful sun ;
> The green leaves quiver with the cooling wind,
> And make a chequered shadow on the ground.
> Under this sweet shade, Aaron, let us sit,
> And whilst the babbling echo mocks the hounds,
> Replying shrilly to the well-tuned horns,
> As if a double hunt were heard at once,
> Let us sit down and mark the yelping noise . . .'

This, it will be found, is more in the vein of ' Errors,' or ' Love's Labour's Lost ' or ' The Two Gentlemen of Verona,' or even of ' Romeo and Juliet,' Shakespeare's true and succeeding work, than the finer writing of ' Andronicus.' For life ran calmly and happily for him at the outset (one must believe) ; and it was only in maturer years that he rose to a lofty vein of tragedy which was his own.

It is no part of our purpose to trace the development of Shakespeare's genius, though that was the essential of his life as a playwright. But it has been done too often and by better hands. All that we have here to note is that now his choice of a career was made. The tide on which he embarked did in the end lead on to fortune—in a material sense. Yet from a worldly point of view his choice was not the wisest, nor was that of any of the dramatists who immediately preceded or followed him. For the poet's career was for long much more esteemed and more profitable. Spenser held a vastly higher position in men's estimation than Marlowe ever attained, or, for that matter, than Shakespeare's ever was. The patron was a better paymaster than the public. When, early in his career, Shakespeare, feeling in himself the power, wrote (but with his left hand as it were) his two poems, ' Venus and Adonis ' and ' Lucrece,' and therewith (a little later) his ' sugared sonnets,' he thereby established the best part of the reputation he was to enjoy, and likewise (if tradition be believed) laid the surest foundation of his fortunes through Southampton's

munificence.* Shakespeare was not much praised in his lifetime. Diligent research has only discovered four or five *laudatory* mentions of him in his own day, by men of small account in letters.† And of these praisers of Shakespeare only one refers with evident knowledge to his work as a dramatist. For the others he is the mellifluous, the honey-sweet poet—he who puts into the mouth of his Coriolanus such words as these :

> ' You common cry of curs ! whose breath I hate
> As reek of the rotten fens, whose loves I prize
> As the dead carcases of unburied men,
> That do corrupt my air . . .' ‡

Why then the constant repetition of ' honey-sweet,' which seems to have stuck to Shakespeare all his life ? Simply because men judged him not by his plays but by his poems ; and these are, it must be owned, in places both sickly and cloying. And men judged Shakespeare by his poems, because, as has already so often been said yet cannot be too often repeated, plays were not of literature. Shakespeare, through the mouth of Phebe in ' As You Like It,' lays on Marlowe's tomb a charming tribute in quoting him :

> ' Dead shepherd ! now I find thy saw of might :
> Who ever loved that loved not at first sight ? '

But it is Marlowe the poet, not Marlowe the dramatist, that he quotes : the line is from ' Hero and Leander.' It was not any calculation of profit, then, but the wiser genius within him that made Shakespeare a playwright. Even such a (for that age) second-rate poet as Daniel was probably, in their day, more thought of than Shakespeare. For it was on Daniel's shoulders that the renowned Spenser threw his mantle when his end was near. Schelling himself, despite his own warnings, has Shakespeare too much in his eye, when he attributes all the popularity of the Lord Chamberlain's Company, in the great years of the Globe and Blackfriars Theatres (1598–1612), to the fact that they produced Shakespeare's plays. There is no evidence for this. The actors too were the most famous. And with the average of thirty odd plays per annum distributed

* Not that we need credit the absurd amount of 1000*l.* (equal to 7000*l.* or 8000*l.* of our money) which the legend says Shakespeare received from his patron.

† This list does not include Nash's reference to Talbot in a ' Henry VI. ' which may or may not have been Shakespeare's ' Henry VI.' Nor does it include Chettle's apology for Greene's attack.

‡ Coriolanus, iii. 3. ' Cry ' is, of course, ' pack.'

among the three or four companies and four or five theatres of London, and the fact that the play only lived while it was on the boards, there was little to appeal to the vanity of this or any other playwright of the age.

Vanity set aside, however, it must be admitted that Shakespeare chose very happily both for his muse and his material fortunes. The interest of the two did not clash, as M. Jusserand and so many modern critics seem to suppose. If Shakespeare, with or without Southampton's aid, became a part-proprietor in the best-attended theatre of the day,* this was a circumstance most favourable to his work. For he must have had a voice in the choice of pieces, probably was the recognised provider-in-ordinary to the company. He was thus precisely in the position which a great composer would occupy, if he were rich enough to have a large share in the opera-house where he wished to be given. And it is almost certain (as we have said already) that even to-day the composer so happily placed would not think beyond the performance itself—the succession of performances—that he might count on,† and might very well be careless about printing and publication. Wherefore, as he had such exceptional opportunities for production, Shakespeare's indifference to his manuscripts is the more easily explained. All the more would the play be *the* thing for him, in that he was an actor as well as a playwright.

It is no extravagant supposition that Shakespeare could not even compose the speeches of his several characters without to some little degree acting them. It is no extravagant imagination which sees him of a morning wandering up and down the river bank on the 'Surrey side,' or passing a little inland to find himself alone, among the wooded hills where now are Clapham and Stockwell; and in this motion or in this place of solitude most easily composing the speeches in his plays; which his actor's memory would so well retain. Many poets (Wordsworth among them) have made their poetry chiefly in their walks, and written it down (or had it written down) when they got home. But for Shakespeare's fellow-actors, good

* Heywood was another of the actor-playwrights who became a shareholder in the profits of his company.

† The succession of plays was in those days much more like that of opera with us than to modern 'runs.' Nine days, as we have seen, was an exceptional run. As a rule a play was rarely put on as much as three days in succession. We see this from Henslowe's diary. But within a shortish period—a year or two—they were frequently revived. Then they (generally) disappeared from sight; and often were recast by a new hand.

honest souls, innocent of any inspiration of that kind, the creation and the writing down were one; hence the improbable legend that Shakespeare composed 'without blotting a line.' Jonson indeed accepted the legend in its most improbable form; but, when Jonson began to write, a change had already come in the position of the play.* It was becoming 'of literature'; no doubt through Shakespeare's influence most of all. For Jonson himself it was—we have already seen as much—altogether 'of literature'; and he fought the hardest to make it this for all the world. In becoming literary the drama lost something, while it gained much. Its dæmonic age had passed before Jonson set to work at playwriting. It was no longer a new birth in the world, with its own rules, standing alone by its own strength. We have seen how little that strength and novelty recommended itself to the erudite of the Sidney type. Jonson was to reconcile the learned world while girding at work which was far above his compass, almost in the same words in which Sidney had girded at the beginnings of the new drama. Jonson had his reward. Though his plays were little cared for by the playgoers, he had all the fashionable, the royal, and learned, patronage a man might desire. And, what to us seems incredible, for about a hundred years after his death, he, and not Shakespeare, was esteemed the great literary figure of the Elizabethan age.†

Thus—life moved so rapidly then—Shakespeare lived long enough to see a change in men's estimate, a certain shifting of the balance, an alteration in the position of the drama itself. Patronage was winning back its power. So, too, perhaps were cliquism, mutual admiration, and a variety of such external forces, all brought in by the rising estimate of the dramatist's art and its securer position. Now, Shakespeare,

---

* Jonson, too, in his conversation with Drummond, was certainly not seeking opportunities to exalt the dead author.

† The evidence for this 'incredible' fact is abundant. Even to Dryden, who criticises him severely, Jonson stands for the great literary figure of the foregoing age. It is possible that Dryden himself placed Shakespeare higher; but he could hardly have said so openly. Samuel Butler speaks of Jonson's pre-eminence as being undisputed. To Herrick he is 'Saint Ben'; and almost all the other poets take occasion to mention him with praise, in many cases passing over Shakespeare (as does Herrick) with no or but the slightest mention. In truth the contrast between the laudatory poems addressed to Jonson in his lifetime, and the few and slight mentions of Shakespeare in his, is very striking (see Gifford's 'Jonson,' last vol.).

if we may judge anything about his private character, had no love for either patronage or mutual admiration ; or it is possible that his love for the first was exhausted by his first enthusiasm for one noble patron—and its ill-return. There are not many of the courtly compliments of the day in Shakespeare's verse. He neither mourned over Gloriana when dead, nor hailed the rising sun of James with extravagant joy. And he never dealt in the small change of compliment and dedication which passed current among his brother-poets.* Perhaps he found his brother-actors a simpler type of men and more to his mind. For it was some of them, not of the poets, that he remembered in his will.

Swinburne has called Webster 'a creek in the ocean which 'is Shakespeare.' We might so describe Marlowe also. For all that is characteristic of the new drama finds its highest expression in Shakespeare. Jonson was too great in intellect not to share in large measure the special greatnesses of the Elizabethan time—its incomparably splendid blank verse, its lyric beauty, its high outlook over the world, over all time and space. Not the less does Jonson represent also another stream of tendency, and anticipates, more than the others do, the meaner literature which was to succeed. His 'Comedy of Humours' is really a comedy of types, not personalities, and as such it will in time lead on to the still lower comedy of catch words, catch phrases, such as Dickens found upon the stage, with very ill effects on his own art. Jonson represents, too, a sufficient mastery of the heroic couplet (in which Shakespeare blundered so lamentably); and that is a kind of anticipation of the eighteenth century. He represents a greater egoism, which characterises not him alone but writers like Fletcher and Ford, and in which the magic power of the old drama seems to faint, turning toward exaggeration, and also toward nastiness, in Beaumont and Fletcher and Ford ; while the very metre and medium of poetry begins to suffer degeneration.

Shakespeare may very well have felt this coming change ; if not with his reasoning self, at least with his instinct of a great artist. May we not agree with Brandes, who sees in certain lines from 'All's Well that Ends Well' an expression of the writer's own thoughts, if any lines which Shakespeare wrote did express him? These lines are reported by the King as the words of the old Count of Rousillon, and have not, for aught that is told us, the slightest appropriateness to Rousillon's history.

---

* See last note.

> ' " Let me not live "—
> Thus his good melancholy oft began,
> On the catastrophy and heel of pastime,
> When it was out—" Let me not live," quoth he,
> " After my flame lacks oil, to be the snuff
> Of younger spirits, whose apprehensive senses
> All but new things disdain ; whose judgements are
> Mere fathers of their garments ; whose constancies
> Expire before their fashions." '

What cause for melancholy had that conspicuous man, the old Count Rousillon, we are not told ; nor is it possible to guess what was the sort of ' pastime ' which could make him anticipate such an inglorious end. But if in place of a ' pastime ' we think of ' the play,' then all is natural enough. While the play had been but a play, not a literary ' work,' it had attained its climax. Shakespeare, who for all his greatness leaned too much on others and was too apt to learn from those who should have learnt from him, might well contrast the splendid beginnings of this dramatic verse—the verse which had captured, and almost as it were absorbed, his soul, in Marlowe's line—with its decay in Fletcher's (who yet had influence over himself sufficient to seduce him into the redundant syllable) : yes, with prophetic vision, his spirit might foresee how for a century to come not he, but Ben Jonson, would be accounted the ' saint ' of their age. If you grant then that for once in a way old Count Rousillon's thoughts in ' All's Well that Ends Well ' are not the Count's but Shakespeare's,* this would explain the only known circumstance of the poet's life which still seems unaccountable: his retirement so early (not yet fifty) from the stage and from all authorship, and his rustication at Stratford, ' where—every third thought shall be my grave.' We will hope at least that Prospero kept not that resolution ; rather that the wood-notes which charmed him at times even from Marlowe's

* Hamlet's soliloquy is generally recognised as another example of the poet speaking undramatically out of the fullness of his heart. Its feeling references to the evils specially affecting men in inferior *station* (not physical poverty) make for this opinion ; and the words about the ' bourne ' (in direct contradiction to Hamlet's recent experience) confirm it.

A third instance Mr. Bradley sees in Isabella's famous speech (Measure for Measure, ii. 2). ' Man, proud man,' &c. (' Oxford ' Lectures: Shakespeare the Man,' 1909). We had not read Mr. Bradley's lecture on ' Shakespeare's Theatre and Audience ' before writing the present article. Fortunately few of the matters presented for consideration here are touched upon in that lecture ; and its starting-point gives it a different orientation.

splendours (see above p. 49) were consolation enough for what the poet left behind. But for his retirement and the breaking of his magic wand, buried ' certain fathoms in the earth,' these things might be accomplished without any keen pangs of regret. ' Everything is paid for ' as Napoleon said. His dizzy moments of inspiration must have been followed by their times of nausea and helplessness ; and, because Shakespeare's creative power seems so unflagging during certain years, he may have been the more conscious now at forty-seven or forty-eight that his flame lacked oil. Though Shakespeare was seemingly always on good terms with his brother authors, he had probably no very close friendships among them (his will suggests as much) ; nor had he the kind of influence which would have raised up ' a tribe of Will ' as a counterpart to his colleague's ' tribe of Ben.'*

His creative power had expended itself in the actual dramas, which for him (thinking in the fashion of the 'nineties) existed while they were being acted, but not otherwise. Of posterity his earliest brother-playwrights, these men of ' the 'nineties ' had thought not much. Their poems, not their plays, were their appeals for fame. Not the less, Shakespeare's better instincts must have told him that his plays were his true title to greatness, and that, perishable as they seemed, they could not perish. Deep in his mind doubtless lay a wiser monitor, his Genius itself (as the Romans understood it), which would tell him that, somehow, death could not touch such things as that Genius had brought forth ; that not so much was he quitting a world of statesmen, of poets, of captains, of adventurers, as that all these glories of the age would for after-times seem to live rather as his shadows than he by them.

---

* It is one more instance of how the ' lenses of Shakespearean criticism ' and knowledge distort our vision to-day, that the famous passage from Beaumont's verse-letter to Jonson

> ' The sun which doth the greatest comfort bring
> To absent friends,' etc.

which describes the things ' done at the Mermaid,' is inevitably described (as by the writer ' Beaumont ' in the ' Dictionary of National Biography ') as telling of the ' contest of wits between Jonson, ' Shakespeare, and others.' As a fact Shakespeare's name is never mentioned in the letter. We have only Fuller's authority for supposing that Shakespeare was present at these meetings. Fuller, however, was only eight years old at Shakespeare's death. And long before he wrote the passage referred to, Shakespeare's reputation had risen high enough to stand next to Jonson's, and (quite possibly) to absorb what was first handed down touching another dramatist.

Art. III.—CHATHAM AND THE COUNTRY LIFE OF HIS DAY.

1. *Observations on Modern Gardening.* [By Whately.] New edition with notes by Horace [late] E. of Orford. London. 1801.
2. *Memorials of Admiral Gambier.* By Lady Chatterton. 2 vols. London. 1861.
3. *The Stowe Catalogue.* By Henry Rumsey Foster. London. 1848.
4. *An Eighteenth Century Correspondence.* Letters to Sanderson Miller Esq. of Radway. Edited by Lilian Dickins and May Stanton. London: Murray. 1910.
5. *Chatham MSS. at the Record Office.*

And other Works.

As Paymaster during the Pelham Administration from 1746 to 1754 Pitt had a time of comparative leisure. Though he took his full share of parliamentary work, his personal responsibility was slight, and no great questions arose to call out his highest energy. Thus the strain of public business was appreciably less for him than when he was putting forth his might to destroy Walpole and Carteret, or later to humble France, and gain a world-wide victory for England. He also for the first time had the means of enjoying his leisure. With his patrimony, his legacy from the Duchess of Marlborough, and his salary as Paymaster he must have had an income close upon 5000*l.* a year, adequate for an unmarried man with no vices even though with Pitt's extravagant tastes and magnificent ideas of expenditure.

His chief extravagance throughout life was to build and to lay out grounds, a propensity common to men of his constructive genius. When he had no house and grounds of his own he indulged his taste on the property of his friends. Landscape gardening was then the mode, and all who could afford it vied with one another in conveying an illusion of vast spaces, distant prospects and grandiose scenery within the smallest compass. It was an age of vistas, of rivulets aping the appearance of mighty rivers, of embankments fashioned into the semblance of beetling brows and rugged mountain-sides, while antique temples, dotted about, testified to the designers' classical lore. Pope took a favourable view of this fashion,

when, no doubt after a pleasant sojourn at Stowe, he wrote the lines :

> ' Consult the genius of the place in all
> That bids the waters rise or gently fall ;
> That helps the ambitious hill the heav'ns to scale
> Or scoops in circling theatres the vale ;
> Calls in the country, catches op'ning glades,
> Unites the woods and varies shade from shade ;
> Nature shall join you ; Time shall make it grow,
> A work to wonder at,—perhaps a Stowe.'

Dr. Johnson was more critical. ' Whether to plant a walk in ' undulating curves and to place a bench in every turn where ' there is an object to catch the view ; ' he observes gravely,

> ' to make water run where it will be heard, or to stagnate where it will be seen ; to leave intervals where the eye will be pleased, and to thicken the plantation where there is something to be hidden, demands any great powers of mind, I will not enquire ; perhaps a sullen and surly speculator may think such performances rather the sport than the business of human reason. But,'

he concludes, ' it must at least be confessed that to embellish ' the form of Nature is an innocent amusement ; and some ' praise must be allowed by the most supercilious observer to ' him who does best what such multitudes are contending to ' do well.'

Pitt entered with zest into the ' innocent amusement,' and was considered the foremost of his circle at ' pointing his ' prospects, diversifying his surface, entangling his walks, and ' winding his waters.' He had what he himself called ' the ' prophetic eye of taste,' which must have been needed to decide when to level a hillock or to raise a valley, where to plant, where to cut down a group of trees ; and he had a sense of natural beauty, which stayed his hand where nature was at her best. ' The ground rolls and tumbles finely here,' he exclaimed at a wonderful meeting of the rivers among the hills of Ham in Derbyshire, where lived Mr. de la Porte, an old family friend ; and there is no tradition that he tried to improve it.

His friends generally turned to Pitt for advice on their horticultural experiments. At Hagley he was in constant request while Lyttelton was rebuilding the house and laying out the property in the most approved style, a business upon which he entered with due solemnity. At one stage the ingenuity of the connoisseurs was considerably exercised as to the best setting for a rotunda in the grounds. One was for cutting down the trees behind it, another for planting it

all round with evergreens, whereupon Pitt, being appealed to, judiciously observed that it was inadvisable to enter upon either course 'unless upon very mature consideration.' *

Near Hagley was The Leasowes, famous as the seat of the poet Shenstone, who piqued himself on rivalling his grand neighbour. Here in tiny compass were to be seen all the paraphernalia of vistas, temples, seats and inscriptions, to embellish a scene naturally enchanting. 'Nature,' Pitt was once harsh enough to say, 'has done everything for you, Mr. Shenstone,' to which the bard replied with becoming spirit, 'But I 'hope I have done something for Nature too, by displaying her 'beauties to the best advantage.' † One fine summer evening in 1736, when for the first time the great people from Hagley rode over to visit Mr. Shenstone, 'Mr. Lyttelton, though then 'in Parliament and a rising young man, conversed with great 'freedom and familiarity and gave Mr. Shenstone a general 'invitation to dine at Hagley whenever he found it agreeable.' Shenstone soon overcame his natural shyness and grew to be almost on terms of familiarity with the great folks; though Johnson gives a more malicious account of the real feelings of Hagley to the Leasowes:

'Lyttelton looked with disdain on the *petty state* that *appeared behind Hagley*. For a while the inhabitants of Hagley affected to tell their acquaintance of the little fellow that was trying to make himself admired; but when by degrees the Leasowes forced themselves into notice, they took care to defeat the curiosity which they could not suppress, by conducting their visitants perversely to inconvenient points of view and introducing them at the wrong end of a walk to detect a deception.'

But Pitt was not to be put off with such tricks. Often, when staying at Hagley, he would ride over to the Leasowes to talk gardening with Shenstone. On his advice the poet removed an elegant little summer-house he had built on the water under a fine group of beeches. Shenstone's biographer, Graves, who was afterwards Lady Chatham's chaplain, also relates that:

'Mr. William Pitt, though a younger brother and his fortune then not large,—with a noble contempt for money any further than as a means of doing good or conferring favours—as he saw several possible improvements, which Mr. Shenstone could not afford to execute,

---

* Sanderson Miller, p. 157.

† Shenstone thus appears to have anticipated the complacency of Whistler's reply to the lady who remarked that she had found a scene in nature almost as beautiful as one of the artist's etchings: 'Nature is creeping up, madam, creeping up!'

gave him a hint . . . that with his permission Mr. Pitt would please himself by laying out 200*l.* at the Leasowes. This, however, Shenstone considered as a species of dalliance with his *mistress*, Mr. to which he could not submit.'

But Shenstone was grateful, and recorded in verse that :

> 'Ev'n Pitt, whose fervent periods roll
> Resistless thro' the kindling soul
> Of senates, councils, kings ;
> Tho' form'd for Courts, vouchsafed to move
> Inglorious thro' the shepherd's grove
> And ope his bashful springs.'

Another friend in the Midlands, Sanderson Miller of Radway, on the verge of Edgehill, was moved to verse by the help Pitt gave him in planning his grounds :

> . . . . . .
> 'And Laurel walk and Strawberry Bank
> For which the Paymaster I thank,
> The Paymaster well-skilled in planting,
> Pleased to assist when cash was wanting.
> He bid my Laurels grow, they grew
> Fast as his Laurels always do.'

Pitt also designed a walk at West Wickham in Kent for Gilbert West, the Grenvilles' pious cousin. Another friend, Norborne Berkeley of Stoke, was reported in 1746 to be 'pursuing a plan of Mr. Pitt's which, by the help of Milton, shall 'resemble Milton's Bower of bliss.'* Wotton, George Grenville's place in Buckinghamshire, unrivalled for its two miles of water scenery, its widespread lawns and deep embowering woods, owed some of its embellishment to Pitt. Both Cobham and Temple successively took counsel of him in the constant additions they made to the adornment of Stowe. Here was the most characteristic example of the taste of the period, not shy and retiring as at the Leasowes, but flaunting and blatant like its owners. Vanbrugh, the architect of Blenheim, Bridgman, the high priest of formal gardening, and Kent, of the newer Arcadian style, who also designed the Horse-Guards, Gibbs, who built the Radcliffe at Oxford, besides several foreign architects, were all successively called in. A guide book to Stowe of 1749 enumerates, in addition to statues, equestrian and pedestrian, twenty or thirty 'capital structures,' which were dotted about the park. 'Their frequency,' observed Whately, †

* Chatham MSS. 34 (E. Windham to Hester Grenville).

† Observations on Modern Gardening.

'destroys all ideas of silence and retirement: magnificence and splendour are the characteristics of Stowe; it is like one of those places celebrated in antiquity, which were devoted to the purposes of religion, and filled with sacred groves, hallowed fountains and temples dedicated to several deities; the resort of distant nations; and the object of veneration of half the heathen world: this pomp is at Stowe blended with beauty; and the place is equally distinguished by its amenity and its grandeur.'

In the 'Elysian Fields' there was a grotto by the Lake hung with sham stalactites and paved with cobble-stones, wherein the Princess Amelia, Horace Walpole, and other high personages once partook of a damp and chilly supper by the light of a few Chinese lanterns.* Temples dedicated to Venus, to Ancient and Modern Virtue, to Friendship and to other good qualities were filled with busts, principally of relations and friends who had earned the esteem of Cobham and Temple: in one of them Pitt himself had his niche.

Pitt retained his passion for improving his friends' properties to a late age. In 1769 he was lent Chevening for some months while the Stanhopes were away at Geneva. When he came the existing stables were found insufficient for his numerous horses, forthwith so more stalls had to be built. Three months later he wrote urging Lord Stanhope to buy a neighbouring farm to round off his property, 'be the price almost 'what it may.' He also proposed to make a new road through the Park as an approach to the house at a cost of 30*l.*, and so impatient was he that even before receiving the Stanhopes' consent he had it stumped out. But the Stanhopes were nothing loth and told their gardener, Brampton, to follow implicitly all his instructions. Brampton hardly waited for these orders to follow out Chatham's plans with dog-like fidelity. The cost was naturally much greater than Chatham had anticipated. An alteration in the direction alone doubled it, and further expense was incurred by Chatham's decision to have it made entirely of stone, not merely rounded up with earth, as was then the custom. But when made the road proved a great advantage to Chevening, leading so imperceptibly up the stiff ascent that the hill in effect vanishes. It is still in use and still called 'Lord Chatham's Ride' or 'Drive.'

Though extravagant in his ideas for other people, Chatham was generous with his own money. He naturally offered to pay for the new stalls himself and if he kept servants occupied

* H. Walpole to George Montague, July 7, 1770.

did not forget them. When the family left in November 1769, Brampton writes as follows to Lady Stanhope:

'All behaved very civil to me, my Wife, and family, and to everybody here. Lady Chatham made my wife a present of six guineas. Jenny Legg and Hughes likewise had presents made them, but how much I have not heard, and give something to all I believe that had any concern in the family while they were here. They left everything in good order. Lady Chatham left orders with my wife and me to have the house cleaned, and she would pay the people who helped clean it.'

With his income when he became Paymaster, Pitt could afford himself the luxury of a house and grounds of his own. He had an official residence in Whitehall overlooking the Park. He also, in 1747, purchased from Lady Charlotte Edwin, an old acquaintance at the Prince of Wales's Court, the lease of South Lodge in Enfield Chace, with the sixty-five acres attached. This was originally one of the three baileys or lodges appertaining to the Royal Forest, the rangership of which came to the Duke of Chandos early in the eighteenth century and passed to the Grenville family towards the end.* Pitt immediately set to work adding to the house and laying out the grounds. In 1748 his carpenter's bill came to 1358*l.* for work which included making a new drawing-room, dressing-room, library and kitchen, a billiard table, as well as 'building a temple' and providing a bridge, a 'porticoe and hexigon' and a 'pyramid 'for the garden.' † Whately says that a happier situation could not have been devised for the temple, which was dedicated to Pan; and he gives details. It was

'of the usual oblong form, encompassed by a colonnade; in dimensions and in style it is equal to a most extensive landskip; yet by the antique and rustic air of its Doric columns without bases; by the chastity of its little ornament, a crook, a pipe and a scrip, and those only over the doors; and by the simplicity of the whole both within and without, it is adapted with so much propriety to the thickets that conceal it from the view that no one can wish it to be brought forward, who is sensible to the charms of the Arcadian scene which this building alone has created.'

Pitt's own friends were loud in admiration of the Arcadian scene. Mrs. Montagu, after a visit to South Lodge, pronounced the Temple of Pan worthy of arousing poetic enthusiasm. Gilbert West waxed rhapsodical over 'every sequestered nook,

* See Chatham MSS. 31; Lysons' 'Environs of London.'
† Chatham MSS. 71.

'dingle and bosky bower from side to side in that little paradise 'opened in the wild'; and the ardour of his sister Molly, who seems to have had a tender feeling for the great man, was so insatiable in viewing a fine place, and her faith in Mr. Pitt's taste and judgement so implicit, that she often stole out by herself and in defiance of wind or rain walked many times over the enchanting round. *

Other friends found greater delight in the sport and intellectual joys offered them by Pitt in this sylvan retreat. South Lodge is 'an accession to the common stock and Re-'publick of sportsmen' for the woodcock and snipe it provided, wrote Legge, who also looked forward to the winter parties at Enfield, 'those *noctes coenaeque Deorum* at which 'we will discuss politics, poetry or that greatest of all the '*Nepenthes*, nonsense *pro re nata*, as our genius shall prompt.' As may be well imagined, Pitt's *noctes coenaeque Deorum* were Olympian rather than Infernal. Wilkes, a very good judge of conviviality, suggests by his comparison of Pitt with Rigby, the Duke of Bedford's cynical boon-companion, that the entertainment at these festivities was sometimes too intellectual for his whole-hearted appreciation. 'In their more private 'characters,' he wrote in the 'North Briton,'

'both Mr. Pitt and Mr. Rigby have generosity and spirit: in other things they differ; Mr. Pitt is abstemious, temperate and regular. Mr. Rigby indulges more in convivial pleasure, is an excellent *bon-vivant*, amiable and engaging. Mr. Pitt by the most manly sense, and the fine sallies of a warm and sportive imagination, can charm the whole day, and as the Greek said, his entertainments please even the day after they are given. Mr. Rigby has all the gibes and gambols, and flashes of merriment, which set the table in a roar; but the day after, a cruel headache *at least* frequently succeeds.—In short, I wish to spend all my days with Mr. Pitt, but I am afraid that at night I should often skulk to Mr. Rigby and his friends.'

A good library was another luxury Pitt allowed himself at Enfield. Some indications of the wide range of his taste in literature are found in booksellers' bills and notes in his own handwriting preserved in his papers of this period. † 'The State 'of North America,' Colden's 'Indian Nations of Canada,' Labat's 'Voyage en Amérique' and an 'Histoire des Antilles' among these lists show how much his thoughts were already turning to America. General travels also interested him, such as Norden's 'Travels in Egypt and Nubia,' Breval's 'Travels

* Climenson's 'Mrs. Montagu,' vol. ii. pp. 8-10.
† Chatham MSS. 74.

'through Europe' and Chishal's 'Travels in Turkey.' Among the books on history and kindred topics occur Voltaire's 'Histoire d'Allemagne,' 'Ludlow's Memoirs,' Hume, May, Birch's 'Memoirs of Queen Elizabeth,' Forbes's 'Transactions,' Lediard's 'Naval History,' Blair's 'Chronological Tables,' Addison's 'History of Revolutions in Turkey and Morocco,' Camden, Stow's 'Survey,' Picart's 'Ceremonies and Religious 'Customs'; and on diplomacy, Grotius, Comte d'Avaux's 'Négociations' and various treaties. There are also some natural history works and classical authors, chiefly in translation, besides miscellaneous books which include Racine, d'Alembert, 'Don Quixote' in English, Guillim's 'Heraldry,' Wood's 'Athenae Oxonienses,' Marvell's 'Satires,' Harrington's 'Oceana,' Jortin's 'Life of Erasmus,' Collins's Peerage, Evelyn 'On Medals,' Dr. Johnson's and Savary's Dictionaries, and many volumes of more ephemeral interest.

These books were bought neither for show nor for the uses of a pedant. Pitt was a quick and a retentive reader, who used his learning discreetly for the purpose in hand, not in idle display of his own attainments. His letters to his nephew are largely concerned in the criticism and recommendation of suitable literature for a would-be statesman; here therefore he quite pertinently shows his close familiarity with the numerous books of classical learning, history, politics, philosophy and *belles lettres* which he urges upon Thomas Pitt's attention. But in his speeches, whether he quotes the customs of the Romans to enforce the need of a Nightly Watch for Bristol, or Shakespeare or Locke to illustrate an argument on America, he makes no more attempt to force his learning on his hearers than when he uses the homely instance of his crutch to convict his countrymen of folly, or hums a line of doggerel to confound George Grenville. His wide range of literary knowledge is chiefly shown by the glorious wealth of language in his public speeches and his extraordinary insight into the origin and history of every problem foreign or domestic upon which he touches. He had that keen love of good literature for its own sake, which has been one of the best traditions of our first statesmen. He rarely wrote about books, but by his intimate talk convinced the friends of his youth that he had a fine literary judgement; not only forgotten writers, like Home and Glover, but immortals like Fielding and Sterne, were glad to obtain his criticism. His children were brought up in an atmosphere of noble literature. There is even a tradition that in the last year of his life he set to work to learn Spanish in order to enjoy Don Quixote in

the original : * and in one of the most agitated periods of his political career he was able to turn away from political anxieties to read through Lord Bolingbroke's works.

Pitt was never satisfied with any house for long, and South Lodge was no exception. He loved the work there, but was too restless to enjoy the fruits of it. Five years after he had bought the lease he told Mrs. Montagu he had never lived there for an entire week ; and in 1753 he sold it to a Mr. Sharpe with all the contents except his silver and books and the Duchess of Marlborough's portrait.† Like Alexander the Great, with all his energy he was more interested in making plans and carrying them out than in the quiet enjoyment of their consummation. His gout too forced him generally to spend a large part of his holidays at either Bath or Tunbridge, instead of at Enfield. Little, unfortunately, is now left of Pitt's work in the grounds of South Lodge. The Temple of Pan and the Pyramid have vanished, the sequestered nooks, the dingles and bosky bowers are overgrown and unrecognisable : two lakes still remain, one with a wooded island which may have been planted by Pitt, the other still haunted by wild-duck and snipe : the rustic bridge is gone. But there stands the house, with its solid well-proportioned rooms, its fine wood-carving in the dining room, and its spacious views over Chace and valley, much as it stood when Pitt and the Grenvilles, Lytteltons and Wests held their *noctes coenaeque Deorum* there ; nor would he have been displeased that it has now become a school for the education of young Englishmen.

Pitt was always a great traveller when health and means permitted. His first act of emancipation when deprived of his cornetcy by Walpole had been to make a journey about England in his one-horse chaise. Generally, though always fond of a saddle-horse for the exercise, when he could afford it he preferred to travel more rapidly. Burke once saw him driving tandem in a timwhisky ‡ through Beaconsfield ; his grand-daughter, Lady Hester Stanhope, says he usually went in a four-horse chaise. And, in spite of the great pace at which he covered the ground, he noticed every detail of the country through which he travelled. ' On passing a place where he had been ten ' years before,' Lady Hester told Meryon, ' he would observe ' that there used to be a tree, or a stone, or a something that

* Notes and Queries, 3rd Series, i. 506.

† Chatham MSS. 71.

‡ A light hoodless chaise. It is sometimes erroneously written *jimwhiskee*.

'was gone, and on inquiry it always proved to be so.' His numerous friends scattered about the Midlands and Southern counties now gave him an admirable excuse for indulging this taste, and partly account for the small use to which he put his own house. At Ilam in Derbyshire, Hagley in Worcestershire, Radway in Warwickshire, Stowe and Wotton in Buckinghamshire, Hayes, then Mrs. Montagu's and West Wickham in Kent, Holte, Legge's place in Hampshire, Encombe in Dorsetshire he always found a warm welcome. The home most congenial to Pitt in serious mood was Gilbert West's at West Wickham. Here, Dr. Johnson said, the owner 'was often visited by 'Lyttelton and Pitt, who, when they were weary of faction 'and debates, used at Wickham to find books and quiet, a 'decent table and literary conversation.' When not bent on any friend's house, he would sometimes start off for a drive by himself. In 1753 he took a jaunt of four or five days in Sussex and jerked out his impressions in a letter to his friend John Pitt:

'Battel Abbey is very fine, as to situation and lying of ground, together with a great command of water on one side, within an airing, Ashburnham Park, most beautiful; Hurstmonceux very fine, curious and dismally ugly . . . Crowhurst, Colonel Pelham's, the sweetest thing in the world; more taste than anywhere, land and sea views exquisite. Beach of four or five miles to Hastings, enchanting Hastings unique; Fairly Farm, Sir Whistler Webster's, just above it; perfect in its kind, *cum multis aliis*.'

One of his favourite haunts was on the white cliffs of Encombe in Dorsetshire, where he enjoyed 'kicking his heels and looking 'like a shepherd in Theocritus.' The estate belonged to his distant cousin John Pitt of the Stratfieldsaye branch, son by a second marriage of the George Pitt who was made by the Governor guardian of his younger children. John inherited through his mother large estates in Dorsetshire, where he was called the Great Commoner of the West, when his greater cousin became known as the Great Commoner: Pitt had a warm affection for him and in his numerous letters sometimes drops the stilted style which was becoming almost a habit with him. He rallies him on his love affairs, sends a thousand kisses to his son and signs himself 'Most affectionately yours,' or 'Your ever affectionate friend.' When he is bored with his own society at Bath he bids John Pitt come over, for 'you 'cannot do so great a charity as to come and hunt prospects 'with me, and keep me from hanging myself.' John's seat, Encombe, near Corfe Castle, is ensconced in a vale that opens to the English Channel and contains in the grounds a piece

of water so happily managed as to have the appearance of forming an inlet of the sea. Here Pitt as usual took charge of the embellishments. When he could not superintend in person he wrote directions :—'throw about your verdant hills some 'thousands of trees . . . group away, my dear Pitt ; nay, if you 'indulge me in this request I believe I shall give up my miserable 'constitution to you to practise upon.' He sends his 'bene-'dictions to the hills, rocks, pines, shores, seas &c. of Encombe—

> Benigni habbiate, et il sole, e la luna,
> E delle ninphe il choro ; '

and in 1757 from his office in London he wistfully regrets that he cannot set 'business for an instant aside to go to my country 'recluse and follow his walks through the solitudes of verdant 'Dorsetshire, through warm leases [stubble], heavy ewes and 'bounding lambs, rocks, sea beach, foaming billows and what 'not ! ' *

Radway under Edgehill, where Pitt designed the 'laurel 'walk and strawberry bank, was another house where the Paymaster found it easy to unbend. Its owner, Miller, was a kindly soul, very popular with the Lytteltons, Grenvilles and all the country squires and magnates in the Midlands, who loved and poked innocent fun at him. His weakness was a taste for architecture, in which, however, he was taken very seriously by a great many of his acquaintances. Lyttelton consulted him constantly on the plans for rebuilding Hagley ; he designed mansions or additions to the mansions of some of his friends ; and the great Lord Hardwicke sought his advice about Wimpole. He also erected a medieval tower which still stands on the summit of Edgehill, and up to which his guests were expected to climb for a cold collation and the enjoyment of a glorious view. The most interesting of Pitt's visits here was with Lyttelton in 1748, when their old Eton friend, Fielding, was a fellow guest. He had just finished 'Tom Jones' and in the long summer afternoons after dinner read it out to the two statesmen as they sat under the trees over their walnuts and wine. Another visit is commemorated by two Scotch firs and a mountain ash planted in the garden by the great man. They are still to be identified by the inscription in an urn placed under them a quarter of a century later by his nephew Thomas.†

---

* See Lady Chatterton's 'Memorials of Admiral Gambier,' i. pp. 8 sqq.

† In 1908 this paper was discovered in the urn : 'In the year 1754 the Rt. Hon. William Pitt Esq. planted three trees, two Scotch

Like most of Miller's friends Pitt used to write to him in a tone of good-humoured banter, one inexhaustible joke being the convention that Miller bullied his tiny and charming wife, 'the most injured of women' as he generally called her. But it must be confessed that Pitt was a poor hand at such airy chaff. When returning a horse he had borrowed, he writes:

'A thousand thanks to my dear Miller, for the use of his Horse, who, I hope will arrive safe. My own are now in condition, and will wait in readiness at seven, Saturday morning, to bear you to the Fairest of the Fair, the great Beautiful, as you sublime Platonists term it. May you every hour become more and more like a Seraph! not forgetting the sublunary amusement of a little mortal packing-up.'

Again in wishing his friend success at a picnic he gambols rather heavily:

'May the grand Landskip Painter, the sun, spread his highest 'colouring o'er the sweet scene, and the fairest Naiad of the 'Lake frisk all her frolick Fancy at the Cascade, and be, what 'you must ever think a pretty Girl, most charming in her Fall.' *

Unfortunately an excessive proportion of Pitt's life was spent in seeking relief, temporary at best, from his persistent gouty ailments. Astrop Wells at King's Sutton in Buckinghamshire, Sunning Hill in Berkshire, Tunbridge Wells and Bath, the most recommended watering places, were all tried in turn with indifferent success. Pitt complained of the 'incessant, 'trifling, unavoidable occupations' of such places, and well he might, where no other rule was recognised, but that of Beau Nash and his masquerading compeers. Still even there Pitt contrived to find some enjoyment. Astrop Wells, that he talks of as a dungeon, was at any rate near Stowe and not far from Radway. Bath and Tunbridge Wells were fashionable enough resorts to attract at the proper season of the year most of the men and women with any pretensions to social or

---

Firrs and one Mountain Ash, being then on a visit to Radway with Sanderson Miller Esq. In the month of July 1778 Thomas Pitt Esq. of Boconnok in Cornwall, being at Radway, thought it would be proper to place this Urn under these trees and sent it from Bath, and it was set up April 21, 1779 by Sanderson Miller Esq.—Sanderson Miller, Mrs. Miller, Miss Miller, Miss Anne Miller, Fiennes S. Miller, Charles Sanderson Miller, Miss Maria Ruding, Mr. Edward Welchman, Mrs. Trotman, Master Hirons Mason, and George Ransford were present when this Urn was put up April ye 21, 1779. George Regnante, C. Miller, 17 years old.'

* See 'An Eighteenth Century Correspondence' *passim* and Godden's 'Fielding,' pp. 178-9.

intellectual gifts, whether they were ailing or not. At Tunbridge Wells in 1748 a contemporary print shows Pitt in company with Dr. Johnson, Colley Cibber, Garrick, Richardson, Whiston, the translator of Josephus, Speaker Onslow, Lyttelton, and, as a counterpoise to these serious gentlemen, the 'virgin' Chudleigh displays her buxom charms. All these were personages of fame in their day and most of them well known to Pitt. With the lady he once at least exchanged some appropriate badinage. Garrick he had known since 1741 when he and Lyttelton went to see him in one of his first parts in 'The 'Orphan.' Pitt was so delighted with that performance that he sent for Garrick and told him he was the best actor the English stage had ever produced. This verdict of the great orator had some influence on the actor's career, for he quoted it as a strong argument against his brother, who was urging him to give up the stage. Two years later Pitt interrupted his attacks on Carteret to attend the rehearsals of Thomson's 'Tancred and Sigismunda,' which Garrick was producing, and made suggestions 'which were heard by the players with great 'respect.'* The friendship then begun continued to the end of Pitt's life.

In 1753 Pitt was again at Tunbridge Wells, and a fairly complete account of his sojourn there may be found in contemporary letters. He went in May to cure a bad attack of insomnia and nervous depression. So ill was he when he came, that West, who went with him, expressed the gravest anxiety at 'the extreme dejection which appears to-day in Mr. Pitt 'from a night passed entirely without sleep . . . while he con-'tinues under this Oppression, I am afraid it will be impossible 'for me to leave him, as he fancies me of the greatest use to 'him as a friend, and a comforter.' But the waters, an open-air life, a glorious summer, and pleasant company had in time a healing effect. He, with Mr. and Mrs. West and Miss Molly West, took Stone House on Mount Ephraim, and their friend Mrs. Montagu, the famous *précieuse*, came with two young girls to settle at a neighbouring house. Mrs. Montagu went over to dine at Stone House whenever she felt inclined for company; Pitt and the Wests sometimes spent the evening at Mrs. Montagu's and provided an audience to encourage the girls' rehearsal of the minuet before they appeared in the public rooms. Later the two households went to the assembly-room balls together and combined for expeditions in the country, 'wandering about like a company of gipsies, visiting

* Davies's 'Garrick,' vol. i. p. 78; Knight's 'Garrick,' p. 35.

'all the fine parks in the neighbourhood,' a form of amusement 'as good for the mind and the body,' said Pitt, 'since an 'occasional day without drinking the waters gave them a 'greater effect.' On these expeditions Pitt often acted as host, performing his part very much *en grand seigneur*. One afternoon, writes Mrs. Montagu, 'Mr. Pitt provided us a good 'dinner at New Vauxhall; the view from it is romantic; we 'stayed there till the cool of the evening and then returned 'home.' Another summer day 'we drank tea . . . in the most 'beautiful rural scene that can be imagined, which Mr. Pitt 'discovered in his morning's ride about half a mile from hence; 'he ordered a tent to be pitched, tea to be prepared, and his 'French horn to breathe music like the unseen genius of the 'wood.' This life gradually restored Pitt to his old self. When the Lytteltons came to visit him in July, George reported that 'he has recovered his flesh, rides fifteen miles a day, eats like a 'horse, and has as much wit as ever he had in his life. I hope 'another month's use of the Tunbridge waters will quite remove 'all his complaints, real or imaginary.' He himself admitted he had recovered much of his strength and 'appetite enough for 'a Dorsetshire shepherd, where I imagine the air as appetizing '(to use the Scotch word) as the breezes of Mount Ephraim.' He was even well enough to go by himself for his four or five days' jaunt in Sussex, and on his return in August, to attend lectures on philosophy from a Mr. King. Pitt must have been a formidable student, for 'being desirous of attaining knowledge 'in this way,' he made Mr. King 'explain things very precisely.' West and Mrs. Montagu were in despair when he left Tunbridge in September for a round of visits to Dr. Ayscough's, Stowe and Hagley. West took to reading Demosthenes; but, imagines Mrs. Montagu, 'you would rather have passed this 'evening with the British than the Grecian Demosthenes, 'whom in talents perhaps he equals and in grace of manners and 'the sweet civilities of life, I daresay he excels.' *

The Bath waters were thought even more necessary for Pitt's health than Tunbridge Wells. He first went there in 1738, and after 1750 let hardly a year pass without a visit; in 1754 he spent 1200*l.* building himself a house in The Circus, then growing to be the fashionable quarter of Bath, where Lord Clive, Gainsborough and the Duke of Bedford afterwards had houses. His chief friend there was Ralph Allen, the Maecenas of Bath, who had gained wealth for himself and advantage to the

* See Climenson's 'Mrs. Montagu,' Lady Chatterton's 'Admiral Gambier,' An eighteenth Century Correspondence.'

public by his enterprise as a postal contractor and by exploiting the quarries of Bath stone he owned. This wealth he spent munificently. He was a public-spirited citizen, an upholder of municipal purity and a great benefactor to local charities. Many also enjoyed his private generosity, especially literary men, of whom the most notable was Fielding. The novelist lived for some time at Widcomb Lodge, a house belonging to Allen at the foot of Prior Park, and immortalised his benefactor as Squire Allworthy in 'Tom Jones.' Allen's town house was in Lilliput Alley in the centre of Bath; Prior Park, his country place, was beautifully situated on a wooded hill outside. Here in the palace he had built himself he entertained the distinguished company who came to drink the waters or enjoy the fashionable diversions of the place. Frederick, Prince of Wales, and his children visited him; and the great Mr. Pope and his commentator Warburton, who married Allen's niece and heiress, were often his guests. With Pitt Allen soon contracted a warm friendship; both were men of broad tolerant views in their outlook on religion and domestic politics, shared the same exalted idea of England's position in the world, and had literary sympathies in common. This friendship stood Pitt in good stead in later years when he was in need of a seat in Parliament, independent of oligarchical connexions.

Pitt's personal appearance during his paymastership has been recorded in a portrait painted by Hoare. It represents him as a rather self-satisfied young man, elegantly dressed and without much indication of power in his countenance. Pitt himself liked the picture, which no doubt represents him in the character he sometimes assumed of a courtly squire of dames, providing the music of a French horn in the woods near Tunbridge Wells or attending them to a philosophy lecture by Mr. King. Neither had he, in fact, yet gained the power and self-control which responsibility brings, and this defect is reflected in the portrait. But even so the painter is unable entirely to tone down the strength shown in his mighty nose, or his expressive eyes and sensitive lips, while the elegance of figure and of gesture well indicated on the canvas was one of the orator's peculiar advantages. To the lightning of his eyes all witnesses agree. 'They were gray,' says his grand-daughter, 'and yet by candlelight from the expression that was in them, 'one would have thought them black. When he was angry or 'speaking very much in earnest, nobody could look him in the 'face.' It is curious, too, to notice the similarity in the eyes, nose and mouth already apparent to those of his great contemporary Frederic of Prussia.

At any rate his parliamentary activity, his friendships and the country pleasures he enjoyed so heartily had long worn down the shyness which embarrassed him at Eton. His friends were chiefly among politicians and diplomats. We hear of him driving down from London in July 1749 with Wall, the Spanish Ambassador, to dine with him at Datchet; but literary men also courted him. Small wonder that he attracted admiration and affection. As Glover says, his friends were won to him by 'his private good qualities, friendship beyond 'professions, industry and ability to oblige.' When he offered his friend, West, the post of paymaster at Chelsea, he did it with a 'grace that few know how to put into any action.' Moreover, in an age of which the dominating notes were caution, lack of enthusiasm and sterility of ideas, Pitt stood out singular for his zeal in life, his audacity of conception, and his contagious enthusiasm for any object, great or small, that he undertook. A characteristic story is told of this enthusiasm. He had promised to lay out the grounds of some friend, when late one evening he was urgently called back to London on State business. Rather than break his word he called for men with lanterns, and, while his coach was being made ready, sallied forth into the grounds and by the light of the lanterns staked out his plan for their improvement.

Perhaps it is natural that a man so full of energy and enthusiasm should have chosen his relaxations chiefly in scenes not only quiet but rendered by art almost inaccessible to thoughts of the busy life outside. Of all the spots he haunted, Wotton, where he sought and found a wife, is in this respect most characteristic. The wonderful beauty of its 'deep shades of oak, softening lawns and tranquil waters, 'like a lively smile lighting up a thoughtful countenance,' is an unearthly beauty and almost insolent in its remoteness from the sorrows and struggles of the common herd. Such beauty was the fashion of the day: a fashion well suited to the aristocratic rulers of eighteenth century England. The Great Commoner's pleasure in such beauty was a real part of his life, a strange contrast to the energy and wide sympathy of his public career.

Art. IV.—AUGUSTE RODIN AND HIS FRENCH CRITICS

1. *L'Art. Auguste Rodin.* Entretiens réunis par Paul Gsell. 1911, rue des Saints-Pères: Paris. Grasset.
2. *Auguste Rodin.* By Camille Mauclair. Translated by Clementina Black. London: Duckworth. 1905.
3. *Auguste Rodin.* By Rudolf Kahn. 1909.
4. *Auguste Rodin.* By Rudolf Dircks. 1904.
5. *Rodin.* By Léon Riotor. Paris. 1903.
6. *Life and Work of Auguste Rodin.* By Frederick Lawton. 1906.
7. *Auguste Rodin, pris sur la Vie.* By Judith Cladel. Paris: 'La Plume.' 1903.
8. *Four Prefaces to Rodin's Exhibition,* 1900. By Eugène Carrière, J. P. Laurens, Claude Monet, Albert Besnard.

Few artists during the last forty years have been subjected to more extreme contrasts of opinion among critics than Auguste Rodin. In fact, it is difficult to find among the many articles and books written upon this great modern sculptor and his works, any *via media* between excessive abuse and equally excessive admiration; anything worthy of the name of sober criticism, in which the scales of justice are fairly and honestly balanced.

It has however been interesting to watch the steady growth of appreciation of Rodin's work in France since 1889 among the most enlightened members of the official art world; even some of those who were not at first ready to accept him and his methods without demur. And whilst—and we think justly—they may still make reservations about certain of his works, most of those best qualified to judge now ungrudgingly acknowledge his great talents. The day of what one may indeed term ruthless abuse is now over; and without going to the extreme lengths of certain English as well as foreign writers, it is safe to say that Auguste Rodin—'the Walt Whitman 'of modern sculpture'—has by sheer force of genius so imposed himself on the world at large, that he is frankly acknowledged as the most powerful of living sculptors.

Among the critics, it should be remembered as an excuse for

these somewhat violent extremes of opinion, that everyone seems forced to look upon Rodin from his own point of view; and, as has been cleverly said by Mlle. Cladel:

'En traduisant tout le sentiment, toute la sensation, il permet à chacun d'y découvrir ce qui lui est personnel, sa vision particulière. . . . Mirbeau découvre en Rodin "un terrible et un tendre à la fois"; Geffroy pense "qu'il est le sculpteur de la luxure triste"; "le faune à la poursuite de la beauté," s'écrit Jean Lorrain; un autre, que c'est un descendant des constructeurs du Moyen Age; un autre, le révélateur de la pensée moderne; celui-là au contraire, une réincarnation de l'âme grecque.'*

Among the general public one has only to mention Rodin's works to discover that they are either intensely admired or as intensely disliked. As a distinguished French authority said in our presence a few weeks ago, 'Rodin is detested or 'worshipped. It is a case, as your Shakespeare says, of "To '"be or not to be." 'There seems no middle point of view.'

Auguste Rodin is far too strong, too *primesautier*, to please those who merely take pleasure in accepted rules of academic art; who resent, because they fear, profound emotion whether it is found in plastic art or in literature. They do not wish to be shaken out of the vain belief that statues and pictures are meant solely to please the eye by a prettiness which makes no demand on the intelligence. And they shrink in angry disgust from what is strong, original, and living, from that which sounds the depths and rises to the heights, because it disturbs their self-complacent comfort, and forces them to feel vaguely that there may be more in it than they can understand or wish to understand. Whilst among those who are capable of judging works of art with intelligence and knowledge, we further discover that this vehement dissension between those who worship and those who detest is grounded upon an old feud which will last, one imagines, as long as art lasts—namely, the dislike on one hand, or admiration on the other, of academic as against independent art—the belief in those who submit with docility to the received formulas of the schools, and the fear of those who, feeling that they are strong enough to work out their own salvation, dare to stand alone and be themselves. That these latter suffer for their temerity is a natural sequence to their revolt against received canons, cramping authority, and tradition. The talented, well-behaved pupils who follow the lines laid down for them find that these lines lead to pleasant

* Judith Cladel, 'Auguste Rodin, pris sur la vie.'

places, to 'Prix de Rome, bourses, mentions honorables, commandes de l'État,' to praise and popularity; and they are too often content with such good things, which are, indeed, by no means to be despised. Whilst the independent artist may for years struggle against poverty, misrepresentation, malicious and unjust criticism, until the world one day wakes up to the fact that the man it has despised, neglected and thwarted is indeed a great artist, who by sheer genius and patient determination has at last won his way, emerged from the crowd of his contemporaries, and now stands a head and shoulders above them.

We need only look back on the history of art for the last hundred, nay, even the last fifty years, to see case after case of these early struggles among French artists, whether painters or sculptors. And among these Auguste Rodin is one of the most striking examples. But he is in goodly company. For the greatest of French sculptors, since the deadening blight of pseudo-classic, academic art fell upon France, have always been those who have dared to be true to themselves and to French ideals, rather than to Italian influence. And in any consideration of Auguste Rodin and his work, it is of the first importance that we should never lose sight of the fact, so often forgotten, that he is essentially a French sculptor, a legitimate and worthy descendant of that long line of artists who have been the glory of their native land, from the nameless genius to whose chisel we owe that enchanting woman's head on the central doorway at Rheims, to Rude's 'Départ' and Carpeaux's 'Danse.'

One of the most persistent criticisms brought against Rodin's work by artists, critics, and the general public has been, and still is, that he has 'introduced' a new and illegitimate sense of movement and action into statuary, instead of that immobility, that deathlike repose, which they seem to consider an essential attribute of the highest attainment in sculpture. They resent the fact that his statues are living human beings, not dead carven images—human beings whose physical action displays the result of some strong, even at times violent, impulse of the mind or the senses. For instance, the outcry was loud and fierce and is not yet wholly stilled, when Rodin exhibited his 'St. Jean Baptiste' in 1880, because he had represented him in the act of walking. Why not, we ask? Did the great ascetic, the great forerunner, sit still on a rock, staff in hand and forefinger uplifted in admonition, waiting for the world to come and listen to his message? Did he not wander to and fro, 'the voice of one crying in the wilderness' to the children of men, 'Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand'?

Which gives the truer idea of the Baptist and his mission—the old view, so commonly accepted in painting and sculpture, or this strange, spare, wild man from the desert, with a touch of the 'illuminé' about him, moving slowly forward with half-open mouth, prescient of his divine mission and of his own coming fate?

But we may well ask in all seriousness whether action, or what we may rather call life, is after all an innovation in sculpture? Surely not. Setting aside some of the great examples of the antique which are undoubtedly as full of movement as Rodin's work—the Elgin Marbles for instance, the immortal 'Sword-grinder,' the 'Discobolus,' the 'Victoire' de Samothrace' as with a rush she alights triumphant on her ship's prow—a moment's reflection shows that Rodin, who, as we have pointed out, is an essentially French sculptor, is but carrying on the traditions of the greatest French sculptors of the past. All through that long and famous line of artists we find that those whose names will live rejoice in depicting action as the evidence and result of the character, the passions, the emotions, the aspirations of the human being. And in Rodin's work numberless traces are to be found of his close kindred with many of these great predecessors, both in spirit and in method. He himself says, 'À vrai dire, toute est idée, tout 'est symbole. Ainsi les formes et les attitudes d'un être humain 'révèlent nécessairement les émotions de son âme. Le corps 'exprime toujours l'esprit dont il est l'enveloppe.' *

We need only look at the lovely, despairing little figure of 'Fortune' below Admiral Chabot's fine statue in the Louvre, flung at full length beside her broken wheel—a figure which one must believe came from none other than the matchless chisel of Jean Goujon—to see how closely she is related to Rodin's exquisite 'Danaïd' quivering with sobs of hopeless despair. Whilst the intensely realist and pathetic outspread hands of Germain Pilon's 'Henri II' in St. Denis remind us instantly of Rodin's singular preoccupation with hands, using them with rare skill to express by their action some inner meaning, some impulse of the human being; as, for instance, the reverent, almost awe-struck tenderness of the man's hands in 'Le Baiser'—a triumph in themselves of the sculptor's insight and poetic thought. Movement we find again in Pierre Bontemps' superb bas-reliefs on the stylobate of François Premier's tomb in St. Denis. While French sculpture becomes yet more realist and full of action in the hands of Pujet the

* Gsell, p. 127.

Marseillais, in his 'Cariatides' of the Hôtel de Ville of Toulon —just such *portefaix* as he saw, or as may still be seen, on the quays panting beneath the weight of their loads—in his 'La 'Terre' and the 'Hercule' for Vaudreuil, or his 'Alexander 'and Diogenes.' The robust and fearless Lyonnais, Coysevox, in his magnificent decorative sculpture at Versailles—the great vase of the 'Soumission de l'Espagne' on the terrace, the fine relief of the triumphant young king in the 'Salon de la 'Guerre,' and his 'Winged Horses' at the gates of the Tuileries—is surely another ancestor of Rodin, not only in sculpture but in spirit. For if Colbert, Le Brun, and Mansart made his fortune, he was great artist enough to be able, when needful, to break free from that worship of rigid, official, pseudo-classicism of which they were the high priests.

When the 'Grand Siècle' ended, and France, kept for sixty years within the paralysing bonds of officialism, cried aloud for light, for life, for amusement, even then we find amidst the graceful charm of her art, men who dared to be true to their own nobler instincts, and ready to show by their works that life was something more than a pretty pastime. And it is of deep interest and significance that Rodin himself cherishes an ardent enthusiasm for eighteenth-century art as rendered by the enchanting Watteau. He holds 'L'Embarquement pour 'Cythère'—one of his favourite *chefs-d'œuvre* in painting—to be a notable example of movement and action. 'C'est un 'ravissement qu'on ne peut oublier,' he says 'Vous voyez 'bien qu'un artiste peut, quand il lui plaît, représenter non 'seulement des gestes passagers, mais une longue action, pour 'employer le terme usité dans l'art dramatique.' And then, as an example of the same action in sculpture, he immediately cites Rude's magnificent 'Départ' of the Arc de Triomphe, which he calls the 'Marseillaise.'

'Ainsi là encore, c'est une véritable composition dramatique qui vient d'être jouée devant nous. Mais tandis que "L'Embarquement pour Cythère" évoquait les délicates comédies de Marivaux, la "Marseillaise" est une large tragédie Cornélienne. Je ne sais d'ailleurs laquelle des deux œuvres je préfère : car il y a autant de génie dans l'une que dans l'autre.'*

Besides Coustou's restive, plunging 'Chevaux de Marly,' Robert Le Lorrain in his 'Chevaux du Soleil à l'Abreuvoir' on the Hôtel de Rohan, a work of remarkable verve and vigour, displayed a novel sentiment full of free, spirited and living execution quite outside the pseudo-classic lines. Pigalle,

* Gsell, p. 101.

too, who at eight years old was Le Lorrain's pupil, was no slave to official art though he worked in Rome ; for the piece he brought back from the Villa Médicis was the vigorous 'Mercure attachant ses Talonnières.' While in the extraordinary 'Voltaire nu' of the Institute, and the fine nude figure of 'Commerce' at the base of the Louis XV. monument at Rheims—a countryman, gravely contemplative, sitting on a sack of corn, the wolf and lamb lying together at his feet—we easily recognise a close relationship with much of Rodin's work. Still closer is this affinity, given the difference of period, in Houdon's famous 'Voltaire assis' of the Comédie Française, and in his busts, a series of human documents which alone would make his name immortal. Rodin's admiration for Houdon's busts is great. Of the 'Voltaire' in the Louvre he says :

'Quelle merveille ! C'est la personnification de la malice. Les regards légèrement obliques semblent guetter quelque adversaire. Le nez pointu ressemble à celui d'un renard : il paraît se tirebouchonner pour flairer, de côté et d'autre, les abus et les ridicules ; on le voit palpiter. Et la bouche : quel chef-d'œuvre ! Elle est encadrée par deux sillons d'ironie. Elle a l'air de mâchonner je ne sais quel sarcasme. . . . .

'Ces yeux ! j'y reviens. . . . Ils sont diaphanes. Ils sont lumineux. On pourrait d'ailleurs en dire autant à propos de tous les bustes de Houdon. . . . Le regard, c'est plus de la moitié de l'expression pour ce statuaire. A travers les yeux, il déchiffrait les âmes. Et elles ne gardaient pour lui aucun secret. Aussi, point n'est besoin de se demander si ses bustes étaient ressemblants.'*

The decadence of French sculpture during the Empire and the early part of the nineteenth century was not due to any lack of training or opportunity, but to the chilling of the national genius, naturally warm, generous and fearless, by the dominating pedagogy of Louis David's false ideal of classic beauty, aided and abetted by the seductive Canova's Italian influence. While these so-called classic tendencies were further fostered by the architect Percier's neo-Pompeian tastes. We have but to glance at early nineteenth-century sculpture in the Louvre to recognise the results of these influences on every side. Some artists show much grace. All show singular facility. Here and there, face to face with a human subject, we get a certain amount of life. But for the most part, if not frigidly classic, all is utterly unconvincing, correct and elegant to the point of exasperation.

But help was at hand.

* Ibid. p. 161.

The same regeneration which Géricault, Delacroix and the landscape painters wrought in painting, was brought about in sculpture by three great artists, David d'Angers, Rude and Barye. The desires, the ambitions, the questionings and searchings for a nobler, more true and living art, which were at once the glory and the torment of the leaders of Romanticism in letters and painting, haunted these three great sculptors likewise—the first two brought up in the strictest sect of artistic Pharisees—for both came under Louis David's personal influence. Out of the heart, therefore, of the classic school came these pioneers, who swept away the deadening, cramping formulas of a false classic ideal by their profound respect for the higher ideals of pure Greek art, and brought life, truth, imagination and patriotism to the renaissance of French sculpture. By them the barriers were overthrown which had so long imprisoned their native art. The way was opened once for all for original thought and individual effort. And although rewards and encouragement are still the attribute of the Institute and the State, even they no longer refuse to recognise new talent, though that talent may have sprung into being outside the walls of the École.

With Barye we come into actual contact with Auguste Rodin; for as a boy of fourteen, while attending a school of art in the rue de la Médecine where he learnt the elements of drawing and modelling, he went twice a week to Barye's classes in the Jardin des Plantes. And he, with Barye's son and some other lads, arranged a sort of studio in the cellars of the Museum, where they attempted to begin sculpture on their own account.

But though Barye—the sculptor *par excellence* of movement, lithe, swift, fierce and beautiful, in his tigers and panthers, his alligators and writhing serpents—was for a time the lad's class-master, his influence on Rodin was slight compared with that of the forceful Burgundian, Rude. The sympathies between Rodin and the great master of the adorable 'Petit 'Pêcheur,' the 'Cavaignac,' the 'Monge,' are great. And especially do we find them in works so replete with life and action as 'Le Départ,' in which one almost hears the voice of Liberty shouting 'Aux Armes! citoyens!' or in the 'Ney' roaring 'En Avant!' to his men, as he brandishes the sword he has at that very moment drawn from its scabbard. M. Rodin considers this statue an extremely interesting example of the progression of dramatic movement, in which one may perceive the actual passage from one pose to another. Telling us to observe carefully, he says:

'Vous remarquerez ceci: les jambes du maréchal et la main qui

tient le fourreau du sabre sont placées dans l'attitude qu'elles avaient quand il a dégainé : la jambe gauche s'est effacée afin que l'arme s'offrit plus facilement à la main droite qui venait la tirer et quant à la main gauche, elle est restée un peu en l'air comme si elle présentait encore le fourreau.

' Maintenant considérez le torse. Il devait être légèrement incliné vers la gauche au moment où s'exécutait le geste que je viens de décrire ; mais le voilà qui se redresse, voilà que la poitrine se bombe, voilà que la tête se tournant vers les soldats rugit l'ordre d'attaquer, voilà qu'enfin le bras droit se lève et brandit le sabre . . . . Le mouvement de cette statue n'est que la métamorphose d'une première attitude, celle que le maréchal avait en dégainant, en une autre, celle qu'il a quand il se précipite vers l'ennemi, l'arme haute.'*

Let anyone try to place himself in this attitude, and he will instantly understand how exact is Rodin's description, and that Rude's statue does absolutely represent the progression of two distinct movements.

Carpeaux, a worthy pupil, was the firstfruits of Rude's influence ; and when in 1884 he gained his Grand Prix de Rome—thanks to Rude, who with admirable generosity had sent him on to Duret's studio, as the latter was more in favour with the École than was Rude himself—it was not the classic formulas of the Villa Médicis but the genius of Michael Angelo that affected him most deeply, as shown by his ' Ugolino.' But when Carpeaux returned to Paris and began work on the Tuileries, he gave free play to his own genius in the delightful ' Triomphe de Flore.' And this was followed by even finer works—the famous ' Danse ' on the Opera House, full of such life, vigour and lightness that it gives a positive sense of air ; and the fountain of the Avenue de l'Observatoire, ' Les Quatre ' Parties du Monde,' turning in rhythmic measure beneath the great sphere that rests lightly on their upturned hands, of which it has been said that this is ' the last word of the sculptor ' of motion.'

With such a line of French forerunners it is easy to see that the accusations of his opponents and the acclamations of his blind admirers, who both, for totally different reasons, declare that Rodin is an ' innovator,' who has ' introduced ' movement into statuary, fall to the ground as not only false but absurd For we may look and look almost in vain to find in any of his works more violent action than in Rude's ' Départ,' or more vigorous and lifelike motion than in Carpeaux's ' Danse.'

This however, though the chief and most persistent, is by

* Gsell, p. 78.

no means the only criticism brought against him by his detractors, as may be seen if we follow his career.

To quote M. Mauclair's interesting book, 'Auguste Rodin 'was born in Paris, in the Val de Grâce quarter, on the 14th of 'November 1840, of a family of humble employés. The child 'at first attended a day-school in the rue Saint-Jacques, then 'went to a boarding-school at Beauvais, kept by his uncle. 'At fourteen he returned to Paris and entered the school of art 'in the rue de la Médecine.'* In this little school he learned the elements of drawing and modelling, and, as already mentioned, he attended Barye's classes twice a week in the Jardin des Plantes. His life from fourteen to seventeen was a strenuous one. At 6 A.M. he was drawing the animals, then copying anatomical studies in the Museum. After his classes 'he 'would lunch on a bit of bread and some chocolate and hasten 'to the Louvre, and in the evening he would go to draw and 'study at the Gobelins.' But it was also necessary to earn something towards his living. He therefore worked for a decorative sculptor. And here, as he himself says, he came to understand the 'science du modelé' which one of his companions, Constant, revealed to him,

'Un jour me regardant façonner dans la glaise un chapiteau orné de feuillage: "Rodin, me dit-il, tu t'y prends mal. Toutes tes feuilles se présentent à plat. Voilà pourquoi elles ne paraissent pas réelles. Fais-en donc qui dardent leur pointe vers toi, de sorte qu'en les voyant on ait la sensation de la profondeur. . . . Ne vois jamais les formes en étendue, mais toujours en profondeur." Ce principe fut pour moi d'une étonnante fécondité. Je l'appliquai à l'exécution des figures. Au lieu d'imaginer les différentes parties du corps comme des surfaces plus ou moins planes, je me les représentai comme les saillies des volumes intérieurs. Je m'efforçai de faire sentir dans chaque renflement du torse ou des membres l'affleurement d'un muscle ou d'un os qui se développait en profondeur sous la peau.'†

Gaining a scanty living by his daily labour in the decorator's atelier, Rodin lived on, working ceaselessly meanwhile at sculpture of his own, till he was twenty-four, when he entered the studio of Carrier-Belleuse as assistant and pupil, where he remained for six years. It was in the same year, 1864, that his first exhibit, 'L'homme au nez cassé,' was refused at the Salon. Three times he endeavoured to enter the École des Beaux Arts—for he was fully alive to the admirable teaching

* 'Auguste Rodin,' by Camille Mauclair, p. 1.
† Gsell, p. 64.

and the many advantages he would have received there—and three times he was refused admission. Disgusted by the third refusal, his natural independence of character made him determine to renounce all further endeavours and to work out a career for himself. He therefore took a commission in Brussels which Carrier-Belleuse, then at the height of his success, did not care to accept; and in 1870 he went to the Belgian capital, where he spent seven years, working first with Van Rasbourg on the pediment of the Bourse, on Caryatids of a house in the Boulevard d'Anspach, and other such works. And while here he and M. Alphonse Legros, who has remained his closest friend ever since, took drawing lessons from Lecoq de Boisbaudran.

But of far greater import to his career was an overwhelming influence he encountered in Belgium—an influence which all must experience in greater or less degree when they find themselves in those old Flemish cities, with their treasures of art. For here Rodin 'gained a thorough knowledge of the Flemish 'Primitives, and of the Gothic masters, who were so strongly 'to influence him.'* And as one looks at Rodin's 'Bourgeois 'de Calais,' one instinctively calls to mind those great Flemish-Burgundians, Claux Sluter and Claux de Werve, and the 'Cenotaph of Philippe le Hardi' in the Museum at Dijon, the Chartreuse with its 'Puits de Moïse,' and the Duke's noble kneeling figure in the doorway; or Jean de Cambrai and the Mausoleum of 'Jean duc de Berry' at Bourges.

Those seven long years of patient, unrecognised work, of deep, quiet study and reflection, were a time of probation which formed the master's talent—'a sort of spiritual retreat.' His great individuality had been gradually ripening in poverty, in silence, in ceaseless strenuous work, not only in his own art but in self-cultivation. And from this he emerged in the fulness of his strength. In 1876 one of his most penetrating works, now in the Luxembourg, 'L'homme au nez cassé,' the bust which in 1864 had been refused as something too repulsive to be permitted to shock the delicate susceptibilities of the public, was sent to the Salon in bronze, and grudgingly accepted. One can only suppose that in 1876 the public had grown less sensitive.

Encouraged by this first success, Rodin sent his statue 'L'Age d'Airain' to the Salon of 1877. The jury accepted it; and M. Turquet, then Secretary of Fine Arts, bought it for the State. To many of us this is the noblest of all Rodin's works.

* Mauclair, p. 6.

Here is the primitive man just awaking out of the condition of a perfect and beautiful but unthinking animal, to the life of the mind and the soul. The head thrown back, with nearly closed eyes and slightly open mouth, the tense muscles, the hands —those wonderful clenched hands that are a tragic poem in themselves—all betray the intensity of effort to understand what it can mean, this world in which he finds himself—all the wonder, the mystery, the terror of life gradually dawning upon him.

But so perfect was the modelling of the statue that the Inspectors of Fine Arts repudiated the purchase, declaring that this almost unknown sculptor, Auguste Rodin, must have taken a cast from life—one of the most malicious and injurious accusations that can be brought against any artist. In vain did Rodin protest. His model had been a Belgian soldier, of whom he sent photographs to the jury. But they 'did not 'even open the packet, and persisted in their accusations.'* Discouraged, though strong in his innocence, Rodin remained silent, when a mere chance saved him. He had to live, and was working as an assistant to Boucher, the author of 'Les 'Courreurs' and 'Le Repos,' when Boucher happened to see him execute a group of children for one of his own compositions in a few hours. And this was done with such amazing facility and rapidity, that the astonished sculptor went instantly to his friends and told them that any man who could do this could very certainly produce 'L'Age d'Airain.' Chapu, Thomas, Falguiere, Delaplanche, Chaplain, and Rodin's old employer Carrier-Belleuse, loyally insisted with the authorities, and Rodin's cause was won. For Turquet was now free to act in support of Rodin, for whom he had conceived a sincere friendship, and thereby endeavour to efface the unjust and damaging accusation brought against the 'Age of Brass.'

The year 1880 must be regarded as the final point of emergence of the sculptor we know now. In this year he sent in a fine design to the competition for the 'Monument de la Défense 'Nationale': but it was not accepted, as the powers that were at that moment considered it too dangerously vigorous, an eternal menace to the possible peace of nations. And what, then, of Rude's 'Défense' may well be asked? For surely Rodin's shrieking Liberty with her half-broken wing, above the dying soldier who leans on his broken sword, is not one whit more defiant than that of Rude. Rodin's much-discussed 'St. Jean Baptiste' was however accepted by the jury of the

* Mauclair, p. 7.

Salon and bought by M. Turquet for the State. And he now gave Rodin an important commission—a great gateway for the Trocadéro. This was the famous ' Gate of Hell,' on which Rodin has been lavishing ideas and work ever since. It is not finished. Will it ever be ? Who knows ?

What artist with imagination, be he great or small, is not at times haunted by some vast and grandiose conception which shall be—so he thinks—his immortal life-work ?—a Divina Commedia, a Comédie Humaine, a Ring des Nibelungen. But to how few, even among the greatest, is it given to bring that magnificent conception to the birth. In some the very *trop plein* of ideas comes between the great scheme and its immediate accomplishment. It has to stand aside and wait, while some fresh and absorbing idea demands with irresistible insistence to be brought to life. And again, as time goes on year after year, the vast idea may have imperceptibly been modified—the first scheme may have grown into a different shape, or the outlook of the artist's mind be somewhat altered. It has been so with the ' Gate of Hell.' During his long years of meditation Rodin fed his imagination more especially from two sources—the austere, symbolic Dante, and the sensuous, neurotic Baudelaire. In fact one critic remarks that ' Almost ' all Rodin's great symbolic figures refer to the " Inferno," and ' all his little groups of lovers have the neurotic subtlety, the ' refined, nostalgic melancholy of the " Fleurs du Mal." ' This, let us hasten to observe, is one of those excessive generalisations which the admiring critic takes delight in, and one which on closer examination proves singularly inexact. The ' Gate ' of Hell ' was intended originally to be a door in high relief, with frieze, tympanum and wide lateral capitals, after the manner of the gates of the Baptistery at Florence ; and on the door and the uprights were groups of small figures, mainly taken, at first, from Dante. The three tragic Shades crowned the highest plane, while below the fateful three sat the ' Penseur,' meditating on the endless confused drama of love, sorrow, passion, and distress of human life. But Rodin in the course of the last twenty years and more has used the great doors for what he has smilingly called his ' Noah's Ark '—a sort of amazing playground, in fact, in which to sketch out his superabundant ideas. Here, while he breaks out one group to form the basis of a single work, often on a much larger scale— such as ' Le Baiser,' which has developed out of a small group of ' Paolo et Fran- ' cesca,' or the ' Ugolino,' and many more—he replaces it by some fresh group of little figures just improvised, that seems to correspond with the general idea of the whole. It was not until

1886 that his first drawings for the 'Gate of Hell' were exhibited. Among the detached groups of the uprights and the doors, besides the 'Paolo et Francesca' and the 'Ugolino,' were centaurs, fauns, and 'abstract personifications of vices,' and in all we perceive that his desire at that period seems to be to demonstrate by intensity of movement and attitude a sense of drama in his art which should break down the cold, false, 'neo-Greek nobility,' which too often merely meant a frigid immobility which the taste of the day considered the highest art. The magnificent 'Penseur' on a colossal scale is now in front of the Pantheon. One of the 'Shades,' a truly terrifying figure, is in the Museum of Lyons, which also contains two of his most exquisite works—the small group of the 'Tentation 'de St. Antoine' and a magnificent bust of 'Minerva.' Goddess and woman at once, this combines the splendour and aloofness of the classic with the intellect and tenderness of the modern.

From 1880 we see that two distinct camps were formed, for and against the great sculptor. Though Rodin's relations with the official world were still somewhat strained, his position now was that 'of an exceptional artist, celebrated but envied, 'isolated and challenged,' yet at the same time warmly upheld by a strong minority who had fully recognised his genius and power; while each year his exhibits in the Salon were keenly discussed, bitterly criticised, and as vehemently applauded.

In 1883, after Victor Hugo's death, Rodin received a commission from the Government for the poet's monument. Bazire had introduced him to Victor Hugo after the famous celebration of the great man's eightieth birthday. And as several versions have been written of Rodin's visits to Victor Hugo, and the difficulties he there encountered, it is fortunate that, thanks to M. Gsell's book of conversations on art with the sculptor, which was published a few months ago, and on which in a recent letter M. Rodin says we may thoroughly rely, we can give the master's own version. Rodin recounts that Victor Hugo had lately been tormented by a second-rate sculptor, who had imposed thirty-eight sittings on him for the production of a poor bust:

'Aussi quand j'exprimai timidement mon désir de reproduire à mon tour les traits de l'auteur des *Contemplations*, il fronça terriblement ses sourcils olympiens.

'Je ne puis vous empêcher de travailler, fit-il; mais je vous avertis que je ne poserai pas. Je ne changerai pour vous aucune de mes habitudes: arrangez-vous comme il vous plaira.

'Je vins donc et je crayonnai au vol un grand nombre de croquis afin de faciliter ensuite mon travail de modelage. Puis j'apportai

ma selle de sculpteur et de la terre. Mais, naturellement, je ne pus installer cet outillage salissant que dans une vérandah, et comme c'était dans le salon que Victor Hugo se tenait d'ordinaire avec ses amis, vous imaginez quelle fut la difficulté de ma tâche. Je regardais attentivement le grand poète, j'essayais de graver son image dans ma mémoire, puis soudain, en courant, je gagnais la vérandah pour fixer dans la glaise le souvenir de ce que je venais de voir. Mais souvent, dans le trajet, mon impression s'affaiblissait, de sorte qu'arrivé devant ma selle, je n'osais plus donner un seul coup d'ébauchoir et je devais me résoudre à retourner auprès de mon modèle.'

The scheme for the monument was modified many times before it was completed and placed, in July 1909, in the garden of the Palais Royal—a most unfortunate and incongruous position, it would seem. The idea is that the poet, nude and half-draped, sits on a rock at the edge of the sea, and with his outstretched left arm he silences the waves and the Nereïds, while he listens to the Muse of his Inner Voice. Without doubt the figure is a very noble and impressive one: but the fact that the outstretched left hand has to be supported on an upright bar of stone certainly detracts greatly from the dignity of the statue. One can but hope that, as in one of the earlier schemes, the projected Nereïds and the Muses of the Inner Voice and of Anger may some day be added.

The majestic bust of 'Victor Hugo' was exhibited in 1885. But already that series of portraits which form so remarkable a portion of Rodin's work had begun in 1882 with a bust of his old friend 'Legros.' And this aroused sincere enthusiasm in England, where from the first Rodin has been thoroughly appreciated. That of 'J. P. Laurens' was exhibited in the same year. 'Dalou,' perhaps one of the finest, followed in 1884. And in 1885, the same year as the 'Victor Hugo' bust, Rodin exhibited that of 'M. Antonin Proust,' then Director of Fine Arts. To those who were honoured by the friendship of that enlightened and charming man, who was ever ready, whether in or out of office, to recognise talent, even though displayed by artists—such as Monet and Rodin—who were outside the sacred precincts of the École, this bust must be always interesting. But, to use the words of one of his most intimate personal friends, and a well-known judge of works of art: 'it is a fine piece of work but too *heurtée*. 'The expression of sweetness and refinement which cha-'racterised the model is not there.' Yet it is curious to see what one of the panegyrists can say about it, as an example of the lengths enthusiastic criticism may attain:

'To some extent the original was aggrandised and ennobled, but

within the limits of the natural. The piercing, hawklike glance, the forehead and cheeks ploughed with the furrows of painful thought, the thin worn mask of flesh, serving hardly for the purpose of the indomitable will—this latter demonstrated in its full power—all these are equally evident; but the impressions unite without jar, so that it is the face as a whole which retains the attention.'*

Such a characterisation can only appear absurd to those who knew Antonin Proust: but happily the bust contains but few of these remarkable qualities which the critic has read into it. As Rodin once said, laughing, 'Il est certains admirateurs 'à la cervelle compliquée qui prêtent aux artistes des 'intentions tout à fait inattendues. De ceux-là, ne tenons 'pas compte.'

Any list of these great human documents would be far too long to give here. But some of the finest have fortunately been acquired for the Luxembourg by its enlightened Directeur —among them one of Rodin's most beautiful works, the portrait of 'Mme. V.' It is difficult to realise that the firm white flesh is not warm with life, that the eyes, half-veiled by drooping eyelids, are not dreaming of some tender, far-away memory, which must soon bring a sigh from the lovely mouth. Though Rodin's touch is strong, rugged, even *trop heurtée* in some of his portraits, such as 'Puvis de Chavannes,' 'Dalou,' 'Falguière' and others, in the savage energy of 'Balzac's' head, or in such a bust as the 'Douleur' of the Luxembourg—the head thrown back, the eyes closed, the nostrils compressed, and the cheeks drawn in with anguish of grief—yet no one knows better how to caress the marble of delicate flesh, as in this portrait, in the 'Minerva' of Lyons, and in many others. And all his portraits of men, though strong and dignified, are by no means rugged and tormented, as may be seen in the majestic 'Victor Hugo,' the 'Henri Rochefort,' 'Mr. George Wyndham,' and the unnamed 'Portrait d'Homme,' gathered together in interesting contrast in the Luxembourg. The collection of Rodin's works at this moment in that delightful museum may indeed be described as an epitome of his art. For besides the busts already mentioned, we may learn how many-sided is this great artist when we compare the three earliest of his works, 'L'homme au nez cassé,' the noble 'Age 'd'Airain,' and the much-discussed 'St. Jean Baptiste,' with the perfect and tender beauty of 'Le Baiser' and the 'Danaïde.' Or the grave charm of 'La Pensée,' with the tragic realism of

* Frederick Lawton, 'Life of Rodin.'

that wonderful little bronze, ' La Vieille Heaulmière,' in which the psychologic idea of decrepitude is even more present than in the words of Villon's poem, which was the text on which the terrible little statue was founded.

At a joint exhibition in 1889 at the Georges Petit galleries of Rodin's and Claude Monet's works—a rare combination of artists of the chisel and the brush, which created a profound sensation—the great group of the ' Bourgeois de Calais ' was seen complete for the first time in plaster. It was finished in 1892 and set up in 1895. Of this group, or rather procession of half-starved, half-naked, voluntary martyrs for the sake of their fellow-men, it is difficult to speak without exaggeration. Whether one has seen them in the original plaster, or as now in bronze set up (on a very hideous and incongruous base) in their own town of Calais, the impression is the same. We must feel that it is a great work, worthy to rank with the great of all time—a work to which one goes back again and again, unable to satisfy one's desire of carrying away every detail, of penetrating the inmost workings of the soul of each of those six superb figures walking forth to their fate, ' les chefs et les pieds ' nus, la hart au col, et les clefs du chastel et de la cité entre les ' mains.' For they are six real men, individual in character, individual in the manner the sacrifice affects each one of them, but united by one idea, which transfigures them with a strange, haunting grandeur. As Mauclair says truly, ' This is a ' reality of all time ; the epic of the sacrifice of the humble.' And we see that Rodin's preoccupation with the Franco-Flemish masters, already mentioned, is strongly evidenced in this great group, to which even those who least admire him cannot deny their meed of praise.

During the next few years, while working on the Victor Hugo monument, making studies for a monument of President Sarmiento with a fine low relief of Apollo and the Hydra on the base, Rodin finished other detached works, such as ' L'Éternel ' Idole ' and many of the small groups in marble and bronze in which he delights. He considers that there should be no ' front ' view ' of a statue—that one should be able, as with the ancients, to look at it from all sides. Therefore these small groups, which enable one to pass round them, to live with them in fact, are a favourite form with him, as they were with many of the eighteenth-century French sculptors. And for these his touch, so large and strong in his big works, is exquisitely delicate and caressing—' minute but never mannered.'

We now reach a work which aroused a storm that is not yet calmed. The Société des Gens de Lettres had given Rodin

a commission for a statue of 'Balzac.' In 1895 he had made studies for it in the nude, using daguerreotypes and a well-known portrait of Balzac, 'in his shirt-sleeves with one brace 'and folded arms,' for the head. And when the statue was first seen in the Salon of 1898, public events of burning interest were utterly forgotten for a time in the wild tempest that raged around it. A torrent of unprecedented abuse flowed freely from the pens of members of the official world to those of the most obscure penny-a-liner in the daily papers. Some considered it a scandalous practical joke. Others said that Rodin was mad, or 'hypocritically regretted that a man of so much 'talent should have made so great a mistake.' Witty reasons, hardly fit for print, were bandied about as to why such a statue should not be placed in a public position. But one of the most utterly absurd accusations was brought by those who in 1877 had declared that his 'Age d'Airain' must have been taken from a cast on account of its too perfect modelling; for they now accused Rodin of not knowing his business, and smothering Balzac in a bath-wrap to hide his own weakness. On the other hand he was warmly defended by such distinguished and enlightened critics as MM. Roger Marx and Arsène Alexandre, two of his most loyal supporters; M. Mauclair, his devoted adherent, whose work, 'Auguste Rodin,' several essays, and the lecture delivered in 1900, are by far the most sane writings on the sculptor we have found, though they may err here and there by excess of praise; and many other writers both in England and France. The most practical criticism however was that of the Société des Gens de Lettres, who, 'already irritated by Rodin's delay in finishing the statue, 'declared plainly that they refused the "Balzac"'—a distinct breach of agreement, for which Rodin might easily have made them liable at law. But he preferred the more dignified course of withdrawing his work without claiming its price or discussing the matter.

Certainly to many of us, warm and honest admirers of the sculptor, our impression when we first saw the 'Balzac' in the Salon was extremely unpleasant. It was that of some formless monster risen in graveclothes from the tomb—the head alone was alive. One already knew that, as Lamartine said, 'His was the countenance of an element, with a torso 'that was joined to the head by an enormous neck, short 'legs, and short arms.' One already knew that Balzac did work in a dressing-gown. But even Balzac's dressing-gown, bath-wrap, or whatever it was, cannot have been quite so formless; nor was there, one ventures to think, any necessity

for this deliberate simplification, one may almost say obliteration, of all folds and lines in order to force the spectator's thought to concentrate on the magnificent head. For magnificent it truly is—thrown back, with a bitter smile on its scornful mouth, its deep-set eyes dwelling on some fresh fact or idea of the Human Comedy that passes before its mental vision.

Yet all the same the monstrous monolith exercised an irresistible fascination. It made everything else in the Salon appear weak. Men went back to it again and again; for even its bitterest adversaries had to admit its power. And if, as Mauclair says, they returned 'in order to attack it, they did 'return inevitably. Plenty of hostile faces were to be seen. 'But many of them showed a secret fear of being in the 'wrong. . . . This same fear might have been read as early 'as 1867 upon the faces of the detractors who stood in a ring 'round Manet's first works.'*

In the Paris Exhibition of 1900, Rodin's works were collected in a special pavilion at the Rond-point de l'Alma, while he also sent eight more to the gallery of French sculpture in the Exhibition itself. This pavilion, containing a magnificent collection of the artist's finest work, created a profound impression in his own country and proved a great international success. His fame was now world-wide; and from that moment the master's position has been so firmly established that, as has been said, 'he now holds the rank that Puvis de 'Chavannes held in the estimation of all artists.'

Since then success has followed on success: a triumphant journey to Prague, and enthusiastic receptions in England —where he has always been admired, decorations and official honours. The marble bust of 'Victor Hugo' now in the Luxembourg, in 1903, and the colossal bronze of 'Le Penseur' in 1904, won the suffrages of friends and foes alike. In the succeeding years he has produced many small groups of extreme beauty and numbers of busts, especially those of American admirers; while a vast and remarkable scheme of a 'Monument of 'Labour' has occupied him of late —too vast, we fear, ever to be seen rising up in the midst of Paris.

One point, however remains to be noticed. Although, as we have endeavoured to show, Rodin is an essentially French sculptor, true to the ideals and genius of his native land and his great predecessors, and a severe critic of the methods of the

* Mauclair, p. 52.

neo-Greek school, his profound reverence and admiration for the antique, for pure Greek art, is unbounded. In his home at Meudon, under the peristyle of his great atelier, a much-prized collection of precious fragments of the antique testifies to his intense love for the art of Greece and Rome. And when accused of 'inventing' new methods, he replies, 'I invent 'nothing; I rediscover. I do not imitate the Greeks; I try 'to put myself in the spiritual state of men who have left us the 'antique statues. The "École" copies their works; the thing 'is to recover their methods.'* For, as he affirms, 'Non, 'jamais nul artiste ne surpassera Phidias. Car le progrès 'existe dans le monde, mais non dans l'art.' †

---

* Mauclair, p. 60. † Gsell, p. 280.

Art. V.—THE WESSEX DRAMA.

1. *Thomas Hardy, Penseur et Artiste.* Étudié dans les romans de Wessex, par F. A. Hedgcock, Docteur-ès-lettres. Paris : Hachette. 1911.
2. *The Wessex Novels.* Macmillan's Pocket Hardy. 1909.

That what is certainly the most complete and competent criticism hitherto attempted of a writer the setting of whose work is so peculiarly and even provincially English as Mr. Hardy's should come to us from France, is a sign that the reproach of insularity is passing, if it has not passed, from English literature. Cosmopolitanism, if attended by not a few evils, has its compensations ; and not the least of these is the free trade in and circulation of ideas which it encourages : thought is not for a nation but for mankind. The local colour in which the Wessex drama is steeped must present difficulties of more than one order to the French reader. That these difficulties should have been overcome argues at once the quality of the reader's intelligence and the worth of the writer's ideas. Were the former not of a high type, it would find the husk which covers the latter impenetrable ; were the latter not worth the not inconsiderable labour of penetration, the husk would remain unbroken and the treasure concealed.

We have spoken of M. Hedgcock's criticism as complete and competent. Both epithets were used advisedly : it is a model of what criticism should be. The analysis of the novels is German in its thoroughness ; the critic is sufficiently sympathetic for appreciation, and sufficiently detached for independence ; his touch is firm, his judgement sane. There is perhaps a certain lack of that lightness of hand which M. Anatole France and M. Jules Lemaître have taught us to associate with literary criticism of the first rank. In such criticism the genius of their countrymen is seen in its finest : one is tempted to pronounce it a plant indigenous to French soil. M. Hedgcock recalls Edmond Scherer and the Swiss school rather than that of Paris, which, while not inferior to the former in solidity of attainments, is its superior in grace of form.

A criticism of a criticism would be at once tedious and interminable ; and it is happily too soon to sum up the work of a writer who may yet have much to give us. But it is improbable that the lines on which Mr. Hardy's thought has moved in the past will undergo any material variation, and

his main ideas have been long enough before the world to be seen in an at least approximately true perspective. In such a perspective it will be our aim, as far as the limits of a review permit, to place them. The attempt would not have been made had it not been for the lead given by M. Hedgcock, of whose 'Thomas Hardy, Penseur et Artiste' free use has been made.

'Penseur et Artiste.' It is on the latter title that stress should be laid. For Mr. Hardy is a consummate artist—in light and shade, in form and colour, in movement and tone. Here nothing escapes him.

'Elles sont si artistiquement composées et si richement peintes, ces scènes, que souvent à la lecture on pense involontairement à quelque chef-d'œuvre de la peinture. Tel déjeuner de moissonneurs—les hommes en chemise de couleur, les femmes avec leurs grands bonnets à ailes, tous adossés aux gerbes de blé et se passant la cruche de main en main—rappelle un tableau de Lhermite; telle esquisse en bleu et grisaille où les brumes de la nuit étendent encore leurs voiles mystérieux sur les prairies, fait penser à Corot; les filles de ferme, leurs blouses brunes à manches attachées par derrière pour empêcher leurs robes de s'envoler, leurs bottes montant bien au dessus des chevilles, leurs grands gants jaunes en peau de mouton et leurs amples capelines—cela pourrait bien être un tableau de Millet.'*

The appreciation fits the style with exactness; and, for the artist, style is inseparable from substance: it is 'his personal 'way of looking at the world.'

> 'It is the mind that sees: the outward eyes
> Present the object; but the mind descries.'

Mr. Hardy sees his world in a series of pictures; but these form themselves into a connected whole. For him, Nature is alive with a life common to things animate and, so called, inanimate: our human consciousness is a fragment of a vaster, more primitive consciousness which it does but enter, and touches, as it were, on the outskirts. No movement of the whole but has its voice for him. As is so often the case with those who live near the soil, his senses are intensified; he hears the stir of the leaf, the swaying of the bough, the hum of the insect, the light touch of the bird. The countryman is more alive to this subtle and minute world than the townsman; the shepherd or keeper than the countryman; the savage man than the civilised: a faculty is blunted, a habit lost by

* Thomas Hardy, Penseur et Artiste, p. 243.

disuse. What are called psychic powers may, in so far as they are genuine, be classed with quickened perception of this sort; the sensibility which finds expression in 'open doors' being, in all probability, a survival of the stage in which the sense organs were undifferentiated, and the organism as a whole heard and saw. Touch has remained on this level; the higher senses have passed beyond it to the specialised use of ear and eye. With all the gain, much, we cannot doubt, has been lost in the process: the life of those who, from circumstances or temperament, have escaped it is, like Clym Yeobright's, 'of a curious microscopic sort.' They see visions, yet they are not visionaries; they discern the earth and the heaven, and see in them what men of closer-wrought fibre do not see. Nor is their perception of the minute only: it embraces the immense and the far distant—the paths of light, the colour of the stars, the silences of space, the passing of the great spheres on their way.

'The sky was clear—remarkably clear—and the twinkling of all the stars seemed to be but throbs of one body, timed by a common pulse. The North Star was directly in the wind's eye, and since evening the Bear had swung round it outwardly to the east, till he was now at a right angle with the meridian. A difference of colour in the stars—oftener read of than seen in England—was really perceptible here. The kingly brilliancy of Sirius pierced the eye with a steely glitter, the star called Capella was yellow, Aldebaran and Betelgueux shone with a fiery red.

'To persons standing alone on a hill during a clear midnight such as this, the roll of the world eastward is almost a palpable movement. The sensation may be caused by the panoramic glide of the stars past earthly objects, which is perceptible in a few minutes of stillness, or by the better outlook upon space that a hill affords, or by the wind, or by the solitude; but whatever be its origin, the impression of riding along is vivid and abiding. The poetry of motion is a phrase much in use, and to enjoy the epic form of that gratification it is necessary to stand on a hill at a small hour of the night, and having first expanded with a sense of difference from the mass of civilised mankind, who are dream-wrapt and disregardful of all such proceedings at this time, long and quietly watch your stately progress through the stars. After such a nocturnal reconnoitre it is hard to get back to earth, and to believe that the consciousness of such majestic speeding is derived from a tiny human frame.'*

The reader will recall more than one inspired mood of 'The Excursion' or 'The Prelude.' But, apart from the transcendence of the external sense, there is little in common between the

* Far from the Madding Crowd, p. 9.

two writers. Wordsworth is a teacher, or he is nothing—to use his own phrase: Mr. Hardy is content to feel and to describe. Both pass beyond the outer shell of perception; but for each its content is different. For Wordsworth, Nature is instinct with a higher life than ours; for Hardy it is dimly, if at all, conscious—a slumbering mass drifting how, whence, and whither we know not, and carrying us with it, like leaves driven by a spate, on its obscure way. The drummer-boy, dead on the veldt, is a symbol of the human race.

> 'Young Hodge the Drummer never knew—
> Fresh from his Wessex home—
> The meaning of the broad Karoo,
> The Bush, the dusty loam,
> And why uprose to nightly view
> Strange stars amid the gloam.'
>
> Yet portion of that unknown plain
> Will Hodge for ever be;
> His homely Northern breast and brain
> Grow up a Southern tree,
> And strange-eyed constellations reign
> His stars eternally.' *

Not so the Bard of Rydal: the gulf of a universe lies between the two.

The Nature-sense is twofold, outer and inner. Wordsworth possessed both. Mr. Hardy, though he has it to perfection, has the first only: hence his sombreness, which recalls that of the Nature cults of the old world. The worship of the Olympians was joyous; that of the under-gods a thing of gloom and fear. Wordsworth felt as acutely as he the burden of things visible:

> '. . . . . the heavy and the weary weight
> Of all this unintelligible world.'

But the thought turned the poet's gaze upward: for the dramatist of Wessex it leads nowhere; and, like the Nile, loses itself in a confused and muddy delta or ever it reach the sea. Brooded upon, it becomes an obsession. Instead of being one of the riddles of life, it is the medium in which life as a whole is presented, a discord which dominates the chord. It is probable that in each case the quickened sensibility came from generations of peasant ancestors; both writers, though their blood was not unremotely gentle, sprang from the soil. This mixed origin accounts both for their insight into the life of the country-

* Past and Present Poems, p. 249.

folks, and their power of putting themselves outside it; they see it at once from without and from within.

Mr. Hardy has the advantage—and it is an advantage whose importance it is difficult to over-estimate—of having definite surroundings; a native place and air. The old order, now even for men of no more than middle life a memory, knew nothing of the landless man. Whatever your status, gentle or simple, you were 'of' somewhere—of this or that county, or town, or village. To this day country people speak of a man from another parish as a stranger; they retain the sense of setting which has been lost in the larger centres of population, where people come and go easily, no one marking how they come or go. The man without local ties is a not very wholesome product of modern life. He has neither perspective nor background. If, as is often the case, he is rich, he has no object of expenditure beyond himself and his immediate surroundings; if he is a public man—a politician or a writer—he is without atmosphere or root in the soil. To those of us who are not Wessex-bred, Wessex is scarcely the most picturesque or romantic part of our island. But it is exceptionally old-world: its traditions, its folk-lore, its local usages are distinctive and tenacious; in all but distance Mellstock is as far from London as Stornoway or John o' Groat's. The condition of the people leaves much to be desired; labour is cheap, housing bad and inadequate. The natural results follow: 'the Dorset 'peasant's outlook over morals and sex is quite the lowest I 'have ever met,' writes one who knows the county well; 'probably the outcome of extreme poverty and rampant 'feudalism in the past.' This is the key to much in Mr. Hardy's work which without it might strike the reader as simply repulsive; the world described by him is one which he knows at first hand. And, with all its miseries, it is *his* world. The flattery of London society, the applause of literary coteries has meant little to him; it is his native Wessex that has his love. It is there that he desires appreciation and sympathy; and the pity of it is, that it is just there that he is least likely to find them. No man is a prophet in his own country; least of all when the prophet is Mr. Hardy and the country Wessex. There are, no doubt, exceptions; but it is difficult to imagine 'The Dynasts' a popular work with sporting squires. Their wives would think 'Tess' improper; the townspeople are too conventional, the peasants too gross, to take the Wessex drama seriously: 'it is foolishness to them; and they do not 'understand.' Conceive, over and above this, a temperament shy, brooding, morbid, and abnormally sensitive—and the

problem is to a great extent solved. To be an artist after this sort is to have the capacity of suffering—and to suffer—above the common lot of men.

We are familiar with the criticism passed by the Hall on the cottage. How—the question is not without profit for some of us—does the cottage regard the Hall? The landed proprietors, whose acres in these days pass from hand to hand so rapidly; the clergy, the resident and professional gentry, here one decade and gone the next—what ephemeral growths they seem to the slow-moving, slow-thinking peasants whose forebears for generations back have ploughed the same fields, lived within a stone's throw of the same church, and been buried in its shadow! They are part and parcel of the place: the new-comers, their superiors in station and in the arts of life, are mushroom growths—a surface dressing to the secular acres, leaves which the wind carries away. Mr. Hardy has a touch of contempt for what are called the 'classes,' and no small class pride of his own. He is a born villager; the Leafs, the Oaks, the Dewys—these are the people with whom he is at home. With their, so-called, betters he is ill at ease. His county magnates and great ladies have, like those of Dickens, a certain unreality. The Bishop of Melchester, drawn perhaps with a satiric touch, and even Parson Maybold, lack verisimilitude. It is not surprising that Viviette should have demurred to a suitor who writes to her:

'Your steady adherence to church principles and your interest in ecclesiastical polity (as was shown by your bright questioning on those subjects during our morning walk round your grounds) have indicated strongly to me the grace and appropriateness with which you would fill the position of a bishop's wife, and how greatly you would add to his reputation, should you be disposed to honour him with your hand. Formerly there may have been times when I was of opinion—and you will rightly appreciate my candour in owning it—that a wife was an impediment to a bishop's due activities; but constant observation has convinced me that, far from this being the truth, a meet consort infuses life into episcopal influence and teaching.'*

We do not know how a Bishop proposes. Sydney Smith was of opinion that the most he could say was 'I will see you after 'service in the vestry.' But, if he desired to be accepted, we do not think that he would put the matter quite in this way.

It may be said of Mr. Hardy, as of Scott, that he was 'felix 'opportunitate.' He came at the transition point from the old

* Two on a Tower, p. 237.

village life to the new, and so was able to preserve customs, traits, and quaint turns of speech which might too easily have been lost. Till railways transformed England the village was a self-centred and, to a great extent, a self-supporting community. Its industries were manifold: the weaver, the smith, the joiner supplied the wants of their neighbours in farm and hamlet; towns were distant, communication was irregular; the linen and the cloth were spun, the beer was brewed and the bread baked at home. Hence a greater originality and intelligence than are now common. Where is a choir to be found to-day like that of Mellstock? Here and there, in a (happily) unrestored country church—Ashby St. Ledgers is an instance—the gallery and the music-desks linger; but the instruments and their players have disappeared. It is a pity. The 'kist 'o' whistles,' compared with strings, is mechanical and a little lifeless; the homely orchestra gave the village folk a personal interest in the services, and kept alive what is the most educative and the most easily practised of the arts.

'Strings be safe soul-lifters, as far as that do go,' said Mr. Spinks. 'Your bass-man is a rafting dog—well and good; your reed-man is a dab at stirring ye—well and good; your drum-man is a rare bowel-shaker—good again. But I don't care who hears me say it, nothing will spak to your heart wi' the sweetness o' the man of strings.'*

The phrasing is taken at first hand. When a Wessex farmer now living addressed an archdeacon with whom he was shooting—much to the good man's discomfiture—as 'your holiness,' one recognised the style given by Leaf to Parson Maybold;† perhaps only those who know Dorset fully appreciate Mr. Hardy's villagers, their distinctive turns of expression and thought. Their shrewdness would surprise the surface observer; under an exterior simplicity they often conceal an exceptionally sound judgement and a singular power of dealing with men and affairs. What can be wiser than Mr. Penny's verdict on Sam Lawson—'good, but not religious good'; or Fancy Day's—'I think I can manage any vicar's views about me, if he's 'under forty'; or Mrs. Penny's—'I fancy I've seen him look 'across at her in a warmer way than Christianity asked for'; or Reuben Dewy on public opinion—'The world's a very 'sensible feller on things in gineral, Dick; a very sensible party 'indeed'? The picture of the old-world parson—*vidi tantum*—is worth preserving.

* Under the Greenwood Tree, p. 32. † Ibid p. 105.

'Ah, Mr. Grinham was the man! Why, he never troubled us wi' a visit from year's end to year's end. You might go anywhere, do anything; you'd be sure never to see him.'

'A was a right sensible pa'son,' said Michael. 'He never entered our door but once in his life; and that was to tell my poor wife—ay, poor soul, dead and gone now, as we all shall!—that as she was such a' old aged person, and lived so far from the church, he didn't expect her to come any more to the service.'

'And 'a was a very ginerous gentlemen about choosing the psalms and hymns o' Sundays. "Confound ye," says he, "blare and scrape what ye woll; but don't bother me."'

'And he was a very honourable good man in not wanting any o' us to come and hear him if we were all on-end for a jaunt or a spree, or to bring the babies to be christened, if they were inclined to squalling. There's virtue in a man not putting a parish to spiritual trouble.' *

Other times, other manners. But there are not a few leaves which might profitably be taken by the new-world parson out of the book of the old.

It is when he passes from things seen to their significance that the normally constituted man parts company with Mr. Hardy. His attitude towards life, his interpretation of its problems, his outlook over experience—the key to them is pathological; the medium, the perspective, the focus are wrong. There have been times when it was difficult for an honest man to be anything but a rebel; and it may be urged with reason that, in literature at least, Mr. Hardy's was such a time.

'C'était un âge de décadence dans lequel des forces réactionnaires survivantes essayaient d'étouffer les impulsions de la nouvelle génération et, tout en cédant lentement le terrain, luttaient avec opiniâtreté. La littérature traversait une période d'épuisement. Le livre qui représente le mieux le goût de la génération vieillissante est le roman, autrefois célèbre, de Mrs. Craik—'John Halifax, Gentleman.' Une société qui trouvait dans John Halifax un objet de contemplation satisfaite pour les gens d'âge mûr et un modèle de vertu pour les jeunes avait besoin d'une violente secousse pour être réveillée.' †

The Philistinism of the English middle classes was rampant; their obesity, mental and spiritual, has been sketched by the master hand of Matthew Arnold. Who can forget Mr. and Mrs. Bottles, Job, 'Bottles's brother, who is on the Stock 'Exchange,' and 'the Baptist minister who had been the

* Under the Greenwood Tree, p. 92.

† Thomas Hardy, Penseur et Artiste, pp. 20–21.

'shepherd of the Bottles family in the old days when they were 'Dissenters'—the Rev. Josiah Jupp? His 'Friendship's 'Garland,' which, slight as its form is, embodies more wit and wisdom than many graver volumes, pointed out at once the disease and the remedy: for clap-trap, Geist; for self-satisfaction, criticism; for convention, the truth of things. The period was rich in great poetry. M. Hedgcock's estimate of Tennyson and Browning is paradoxical; to speak of the one as 'le poète attitré de la cour,' and to see in the other 'une 'facile optimisme fondé sur une foi aveugle,' * is, surely little short of grotesque. 'In Memoriam'—and the same may be said of 'Christmas-Eve' and 'Easter Day'—struck a higher note than has been reached by our own generation. What is true is that the fiction and, in general, the art of the time—Frith was its characteristic painter—were beneath contempt. The revolt came, as it was bound to come; but it was so excessive that it corrected itself. No poet of Mr. Swinburne's rank would now publish 'Poems and Ballads'; no writer of Mr. Hardy's distinction would work to-day on Mr. Hardy's lines. That this is so is due not to a revival of convention but to a saner outlook over human nature and life.

The sex obsession which characterises the Wessex drama is physiologically painful. Take the famous passage in what is perhaps its masterpiece, 'Tess of the D'Urbervilles':

> 'The air of the sleeping-chamber seemed to palpitate with the hopeless passion of the girls. They writhed feverishly under the oppressiveness of an emotion thrust on them by cruel Nature's law—an emotion which they had neither expected nor desired. The incident of the day had fanned the flame that was burning the inside of their hearts out, and the torture was almost more than they could endure. The differences which distinguished them as individuals were abstracted by this passion, and each was but portion of one organism called sex.' †

Or the church scene in 'Jude the Obscure,' in which Sue rehearses with Jude the marriage ceremony which she is to go through the same day with his rival:

> 'I like to do things like this,' she said in the delicate voice of an epicure in emotions, which left no doubt that she spoke the truth.
>
> 'I know you do,' said Jude.
>
> 'They are interesting, because they have probably never been done before. I shall walk down the church like this with my husband in about two hours, shan't I?'

---

* P. 23. † P. 188.

'No doubt you will.'

'Was it like this when you were married?'

'Good God, Sue—don't be so awfully merciless.'

'Ah, you are vexed! And I promised never to vex you! . . . I suppose I oughtn't to have asked you to bring me in here. My curiosity to hunt up a new sensation always leads me into these scrapes.'*

The psychology in each case is rather French than English; and it is probable that a French critic would describe it as *malsaine*.

In normally constituted men and women sex is an important, a vitally important, fact. That it should either remain undeveloped, or be developed on wrong lines, is a physical and connotes a moral defect. But it is neither the whole of life nor all man. 'What else is there to think about?' asks Gaston, in 'Le Zèbre,' when twitted with always thinking of women. He is not a particularly wise person; and in a Palais Royal farce the sentiment passes muster. But in a great writer it is incongruous; and the reader recalls the counsel of Arminius, sent through 'Leo Adolescens' of the 'Daily Tele-'graph,' to Azamat-Batuk. 'At hearing the clever Turk's 'name, "Tell him only," whispered Arminius, "when he writes "about the sex, not to show such a turn for sailing so very "near the wind."'† Malebranche saw all things in God. This is, no doubt, permissible. But to see all things in sex is to see them out of focus; the presentation does not correspond to the fact. For life is manifold: its chord is too full to tolerate the monotonous persistence of one note.

Not every fact of experience is suitable for reproduction: in particular, pathological conditions are not subject-matter for art. Experience, as such, is a raw material; to prepare it for use we must introduce a mental element; we must select, rationalise, adapt. Limit, the Greeks held rightly, is a condition of sanity: the ἄπειρον is either above, or below, man. To put it in other words, art is to Nature what mind is to sense. It discriminates and interprets. Under its action the universe of things, formless itself, takes form and meaning; the world as we know it springs to being before our eyes. Our knowledge, it is true, is relative: to no two minds does Nature present precisely the same aspect, or the same formula convey precisely the same sense. But the relative is not the arbitrary or the merely subjective: there is an approximate

* P. 214.

† Friendship's Garland, p. 108.

standard to which normally constituted faculties approximately conform. Arabella attracting Jude by throwing raw pig-meat in his face is, strictly speaking, unpresentable; the night scene between Miss Aldclyffe and Cytherea borders upon, if it does not pass over into, the perverse. 'Le ton de toute cette 'scène est franchement déplaisant; les sentiments prêtés à 'Miss Aldclyffe, se présentent sous une forme peu délicate, peu 'féminine, et l'impression produite dans l'esprit du lecteur n'est 'favorable ni à elle ni à l'auteur.'*

This preoccupation with the details of sex does not carry with it a high view of women. The contrary is the case.

'Reprenons en quelques phrases le caractère de la femme, en général, chez Mr. Hardy. Elle a toutes les qualités du cœur: elle est dévouée et compatissante, bonne et patiente, sensible et, souvent, désintéressée. Mais c'est une enfant—vaniteuse, faible, capricieuse, peu candide, sans conscience. Son intelligence est insuffisamment développée pour faire contrepoids à ses impulsions intérieures. Elle est plus sensuelle que l'homme, parce qu'elle est plus tenue par la partie physique de sa nature. L'amour occupe la plus grande place dans sa vie parce que c'est elle qui, par l'amour, travaille à la continuation de la race. De là suit qu'elle est la tentatrice, *l'échanson de l'amour* de Schopenhauer, la *janua diaboli* de l'Eglise. De là suit aussi qu'elle est un centre de discorde, une force centrifuge. De là aussi, chez la femme moderne, le tiraillement entre le cerveau, qui veille aux intérêts de l'individu, et le cœur, qui travaille pour l'espèce.' †

This view of women, familiar to us in the Old Testament, and not wholly overcome in the New, is that traditional in the East. It is foreign to the Northern nations; such right of citizenship as it has acquired among us is due, in the first place, to Oriental religious influences, and, in the second, to the fact that the education of women is some centuries in arrear. Each of these causes is in course, and in rapid course, of removal. Religion is ceasing to be Oriental; education is ceasing to be confined to men. And the estimate of women based upon them has ceased to be tenable. Feminism has re-shaped the sex problem; and with its re-shapement the lines on which it will be solved are coming into view. Solomon and Mr. George Bernard Shaw have, at first sight, little in common. But it is probable that a new generation will class 'Man and Super-'man' with Ecclesiastes—less as documents of the present than as monuments of the past.

---

* Thomas Hardy, Penseur et Artiste, p. 63.
† P. 310.

The 'souffrance métaphysique' which characterises Mr. Hardy's outlook on life finds, perhaps, its highest expression in the fine lines with which his 'Poems of the Past and Present' close:*

ΆΓΝΩΣΤΩ ΘΕΩ.

Long have I framed weak phantasies of Thee,
O Willer masked and dumb!
Who makest Life become,—
As though by labouring all-unknowingly,
Like one whom reveries numb.

How much of consciousness informs Thy will,
Thy biddings, as if blind,
Of death-inducing kind,
Naught shows to us ephemeral ones, who fill
But moments in Thy mind.

Perhaps Thy ancient rote-restricted ways
Thy ripening rule transcends;
That listless effort tends
To grow percipient with advance of days,
And with percipience mends.

For, in unwonted purlieus, far and nigh,
At whiles or short or long,
May be discerned a wrong
Dying as of self-slaughter; whereat I
Would raise my voice in song.

The glimmer of light is faint. The race of men passes before us, like exiles bound for Siberia driven over the Russian plain. We are impelled by a sullen inexorable Power, whose pressure we feel, but whose motives are a riddle to us. The 'great task of happiness,' the 'glorious morning face' with which the strenuous Scottish poet confronted destiny—what a gulf lies between Wessex and the Lothians! How the blade, sharp set and fine tempered, rusts in the sleepy Southern air! Behind what Mr. Hardy calls the 'vulpine slyness' of Nature stands the irresistible irony of Fate in the background: happiness is 'but the transient episode in a general 'drama of pain.' †

There are two distinct standpoints—we may take R. L. Stevenson and Mr. Hardy as respectively representing them—from which we may regard life: that of the optimist, who lays stress on the good, and that of the pessimist, who lays stress

* P. 45.

† The Mayor of Casterbridge, p. 406.

on the evil, that is in it. Both are familiar to us in literature and, probably, in experience: which of the two most nearly represents the truth of things? The answer seems to be that both are true, and both false. Each, that is to say, represents one side, or aspect, of the facts; and, if we will see them steadily and whole, must be supplemented by the other: each is misleading when taken alone. Each is psychological—one might almost say physical; for it is conditioned by physical causes. The one comes naturally to a high, the other to a low vitality. Hence their alternations; for in generations, as in individuals, vitality ebbs and flows. The revival of pessimism in literature and, to a lesser extent, in consciousness is one of the features of our time. Its great name in European thought is Schopenhauer; but Mr. Gosse, in a very interesting letter printed by M. Hedgcock,* has shown Hardy's independence of this philosopher: ideas of this kind are in the air. The tradition on which this particular view of things rests comes to us from the East: the interest taken in Oriental civilisations and beliefs gave it currency in Europe; it blended easily enough with certain prepossessions and commended itself to certain temperaments, and so became a fashion—it is not too much to say a pose. With Mr. Hardy it would seem to be temperamental; it forms at once the setting of his experience and the mould of his thought. He is quite curiously destitute of the spirit of adventure—here again he may be contrasted with Stevenson—and adventure is the most distinctive note of life.

> 'O to be up and doing, O
> Unfearing and unshamed to go
> In all the uproar and the press
> About my human business!
> My undissuaded heart I hear
> Whisper courage in my ear.
> With voiceless calls, the ancient earth
> Summons me to a daily birth.
> Thou, O my Love, ye, O my friends—
> The gist of life, the end of ends—
> To laugh, to love, to live, to die,
> Ye call me by the ear and eye.'

Is not this worth a century of stagnation in Wessex? Years are measured by their content, not their number. The 'crowded hour of glorious life' passes quickly; but it carries us onward and upward, and not to have lived it is to have been less than man. The figures on Mr. Hardy's stage are too passive

* P. 399.

for either initiative or resistance: they are driven by their circumstances and their sluggish brute passions; they do not act. 'In stagnant vivaries they lie.' The more energetic break away at all costs; for life is for the adventurous: 'the 'kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent bear 'it away.' He is a *genre* painter—in his *genre* eminent, and even supreme. But we do not go to him for life at its highest, or for 'experience as a whole.' In our own age less than in any. There have been, and may be again, times in which the world settles down, as it were, to live on its capital. It has goods laid up for many years; it anticipates no great change in the conditions of life, outer or inner; it can take things easily, it seems; the future is remote, and can be left to work out its own problems when they arise. Our time is of another type. The stirrings of the great deep are heard all round us; the forms of life—material, mental, and moral—are changing before our eyes. No message which is not a call to action is likely to find a hearing: when the decks are cleared for action non-combatants are sent below with little ceremony: it is not only that they are not wanted; they are in the way. If this holds of moderate men, whose words, wise and balanced as they may be, fail to rise above the noise of the conflict, how much more of those who of set purpose ignore the issues, and stand apart from the common interests of their kind! Meroz is their type in Scripture: in secular history they suggest those cautious citizens against whom the Greek lawgiver pronounced the penalty of exile, not for what they had done, but for what they had left undone; because they had held aloof from civil strife.

The case against received beliefs and institutions, a case whose strength it would be foolish to minimise, owes much to the fact that they are in possession. Were they not so, it would be materially weakened. Received ideas are defended by stupid people and with bad reasoning: the attack, valid enough against those persons and their apologetic, passes beyond them; and its convincingness in this further province is rather assumed than proved. If we imagine the assailants in possession the situation would be changed materially. The facile optimism of Pangloss is easily refuted. An established pessimism would be no less easily riddled by a hostile fire. The 'facts' on which it relies are to a great extent constructions. We feel, for example, that we ourselves, were we taken out of our surroundings and set down in the slums, should be miserable, and we infer that the natives of slum land are so. It does not follow. It is, perhaps, to be desired that it did follow; for, in this

case, slum land would have ceased to exist before now. The first duty of a social reformer is to make those who live below the margin of civilisation discontented with their lot; for such discontent on their part is a condition of reform. Again we are apt to overlook the principle of compensation at work in human things. It is expressed in the homely proverb—'God 'tempers the wind to the shorn lamb.' Defect on one side is balanced by developement on another; the equilibrium even of sense may be, in part at least, re-established, loss on one side made up by gain on another; the blind man's hearing, the deaf man's sight, are often intense. It is probable that the externals of life rank in our estimation greatly above their real value. The rich, as such, are not happier than the poor, the strong than the sickly: that 'a man's life consisteth 'not in the abundance of the things that he possesseth' is not only Scripture but sense. Happiness is not necessarily in proportion to the means of enjoyment at our disposal: pleasure and pain, virtue and vice, temptation and immunity from temptation, are less unequally distributed than we imagine. We see the surface only; and conclude, erroneously, from what appears to what does not appear. Such reflections as these should not, indeed, check our aspirations and efforts towards the improvement of the world and of mankind—this would be to let them degenerate into callousness. But when we are taking a general view of experience with a view to the construction of a life-philosophy they have their place. The philanthropist and the reformer are, relatively at least, optimists: it would be impossible to name a single worker for human betterment who has taken the darker view. For the world contains happiness as well as unhappiness; and the conclusion indicated by the facts is that the former is on the increase, and the latter on the decrease—though in neither case is the process either so rapid or so uninterrupted as we could desire.

So, too, with Free Will and Theism. Were Determinism and Atheism in possession, their defenders would be hard put to it on the side of apologetic. Could there be a greater persuasive to Theism than the vapidity of the million pulpits of Christendom arguing the fool's thesis—that 'there is no God'?* Neither thesis nor counter-thesis is free from difficulties:

'They see not clearliest who see all things clear.'

* Psalm xiv. 1.

But those which attend the latter are the weightier and the more numerous: and this is what justifies the venture of belief, which, in the last resort, is that of life and action. For the pragmatist pessimism is refuted by the fact that it leads nowhere—its opposite, if an illusion, is one necessary for our state: and for the philosopher by its one-sided presentation of the facts of experience, which, if not very good, are not very evil—but mixed, tolerable, and in a way to improve. 'Sanabiles fecit homines super terram': they are healable, if, as yet, not healed.

So with Necessity, or Fate. Our instinctive resentment at the former notion shows that it does not cover the whole field of our action. If this were so, freedom would lie below the horizon; the feeling, though it can tell us little of its scale or nature, indicates the fact. While, with regard to the latter, while it is true that the element of the incalculable plays a greater part in human affairs than moralists are willing to admit, to introduce Chance, or Fortune, as a *deus ex machina* is to do violence to the probabilities. Of the purposeful accidents in 'Two on a Tower' M. Hedgcock remarks:

'Un, deux, trois peut-être pourraient se produire; mais en imaginer toute une série, menant vers un but bien défini, c'est accorder au hasard un rôle qui dépasse celui que lui attribuent la plupart des hommes, surtout dans un âge positif et scientifique; c'est croire à une direction des événements extérieure et supérieure à la volonté humaine.'

Is such a belief atavistic? It may well be so: the Idols of the Tribe are subdivided—there are those of the *gens* and the *ordo* as well as of the race as a whole. In any case it has to be discounted.

'C'est, donc, parce que M. Hardy, pleinement conscient du dénoûment éventuel, présente la vie de ses personnages compliquée par des obstacles extérieures qui déjouent leurs dessins d'une façon ironique, que nous le trouvons dénué de cet esprit positif, scientifique, matériel, qui est la marque de l'homme moderne.'*

Mr. Hardy's art is not didactic in form. But it is detached from the social order, secular and religious; it passes, as if this order were non-existent, on its sombre way. At times a more positive note emerges.

---

* Thomas Hardy, Penseur et Artiste, pp. 146–7.

Spirit of the Pities.
'What is the creed that these rich rites disclose?'

Spirit of the Years.
'A local thing called Christianity,
Which the wild dramas of the wheeling spheres
Include, with divers other such, in dim
Pathetical and brief parentheses,
Beyond whose span, uninfluenced, unconcerned,
The systems of the suns go sweeping on
With all their many-mortaled planet train
In mathematic roll unceasingly.'*

This studied aloofness leaves out of account the nature of things. For we are not born into a universe in which we have each of us to make his own world—society, beliefs, institutions, etc.—but into a world formed by the many generations which have preceded us, into a system which on the whole has worked satisfactorily and shown itself capable of developement on rational lines. It is natural to take this as our basis. There have been circumstances under which, not indeed a new departure—we are so held by the past that this is impossible—but an attitude of revolt against the tyranny of custom has been justified. Such circumstances characterised the period of the Reformation, and (in our own history) that of the Great Rebellion and the Revolution of 1688. But they are exceptional, and unlikely to recur. For they presuppose the stereotyping of the old order; and, in our time, the old order is inspired by and aspires after the new. The world in which we find ourselves is not such as to drive us either to rebellion or to despair. To break with it is to impair, or even to destroy, our prospect of being of use in our generation. The lonely furrow is not ploughed with impunity; life is a common venture towards a common end.

Such considerations, it may seem, are ethical rather than aesthetic. Contemplation is not action: and you cannot lay down beforehand what a man shall contemplate; his is the eye that sees. Few however conceive contemplation as an end in itself; we are men in a society, and among men. And the less a man is in touch with his fellows the less weight can he hope to carry with them; a certain community of outlook is a condition of a common life. It was a saying of an English divine that there was more to be learned from those with whom

* The Dynasts, p. 33. See also Edinburgh Review, April, 1908.

we differ than from those with whom we agree. He had in view theologians more advanced than himself, and nearer to the general opinion which is forming itself among experts: the saying would not hold good of a writer, however eminent, who had derailed himself, and gone off the main line of thought. Still less of one whose conclusion was a mere passivity; to whom the tide of circumstance in which we are involved seemed so irresistible that the one course open to men was to let themselves be borne along by it to an unknown and distant sea. Against this human nature protests so vigorously that, for the forward section of the race, it can be no more than a back eddy. Mr. Hardy is too great an artist for his work to be lost; but it is probable that, because it expresses a mood rather than the substance of consciousness, it will survive as a work of art not as a living force; that, while those who are sensible of the pathos of human things will turn from time to time to it for an impression akin to their own, those who live in the open will look and pass by. This is not to disparage the work of an artist who stands perhaps the first, certainly among the first, of his generation; but to classify it, and place it, as the curator of a gallery places a great picture, in its proper school.

'Le définir comme un romancier dramatique, c'est le placer sur un terrain ferme. Si l'on comprend que son but principal est de nous faire sentir toute l'horreur de la vie, de nous y faire voir "un tangible dilemme" où l'homme se trouve pris, de purger les passions en les excitant et faire naître ainsi un sentiment de pitié et de douceur envers nos semblables, on cessera de lui demander ce qui l'intéresse bien moins: une profonde analyse psychologique et une imitation précise de la vie.

Comme penseur, il convient évidemment de le placer dans ce groupe de pessimistes occidentaux composé de Léopardi, Alfred de Vigny, Schopenhauer, et Renan. Il dépasse Léopardi et de Vigny par tout ce que la science moderne a apporté à notre compréhension des conditions de l'existence; si son désespoir est fondé comme le leur sur un sentiment personnel, il s'appuie en outre sur des spéculations universelles. Son œuvre nous paraît comme la réalisation par l'art, de cette même pensée qui se développe logiquement dans la philosophie de Schopenhauer. S'il fallait croire qu'elle contient quelque chose de plus moderne que la doctrine du grand pessimiste allemand, nous découvririons cette différence dans une attitude plus calme, et dans l'espérance—faiblement conçue, il est vrai—que ce progrès, qu'on ne peut nier à l'intelligence humaine, s'étende avec le temps à l'univers tout entier.' *

It is natural to compare Mr. Hardy, whether by contrast or

* Thomas Hardy, Penseur et Artiste, p. 481.

connexion, with his great contemporary George Meredith. The contrast, both in substance and in form, is marked. He has none of Meredith's allusiveness; his style is simple; not a sentence in the novels has to be re-read. His standpoint is individualistic; the thought is based on the only reality recognised by him—the self. Like Renan, he is a spectator of rather than an actor in the universe; the world is a panorama which he surveys, but from which, as far as may be, he stands apart. Meredith's outlook is radically different. To the individual he opposes the race, to speculation science, to contemplation action; for him the self is at once lost and found in the community, as the part in the whole. He believes in the world, in mankind, in the future—and in himself. If he falls, he will fall fighting; but he does not think that he will fall. Life is neither vanity nor suffering; even if we prescind from the ultimates, it is a succession of efforts, each of which has its interest and its worth. He teaches, and teaches greatly. If his appeal is primarily to the understanding, we shall do well to remember that this faculty is the key to our nature. It is by the direction given by it to the passions that these become human: the flood that might have devastated a province flows, a fertilising stream, in fixed channels and between massive banks.

'Il redoute le cœur et lui préfère le cerveau. Il ne veut pas faire appel aux émotions, à la partie instinctive de notre être, mais à l'intelligence et au raisonnement. Il ne nous invite pas à souffrir *avec ses personnages*; mais à penser *à propos d'eux*, à les observer, à les critiquer avec lui. C'est moins un poète qu'un professeur de psychologie.'

This is extraordinarily true to life: though it should perhaps be added that for Meredith, as for so many thinkers of his generation, psychology was what Ontology was to the scholastics—the science of the sciences; the science, in particular, into which all knowledge bearing on man, on life, and on destiny was ultimately resolved. Mr. Hardy's conception of art is diametrically opposed to Meredith's. This is so both in tendency and standpoint. The two stand to one another as Sense and Sensibility. Eleanor, we think, is to be preferred to Marianne. M. Hedgcock judges differently.

'A notre avis la qualité maîtresse du grand romancier, de celui qui veut peindre le tableau entier de la vie, doit être cette mémoire du cœur qui s'appelle la sensibilité. Pouvoir non simplement sentir profondément *avec* les autres, mais garder cette émotion et la reproduire à volonté, afin de recréer les scènes du passé ou de créer, par de nouvelles combinaisons, des scènes

inédites, voilà qui dépasse la simple critique de la vie ou la froide copie de la réalité. Celui qui possède une sensibilité aiguë vit d'une manière plus intense que les autres ; les joies et les malheurs d'autrui réagissent sur lui avec une double force, il enregistre de façon indélébile tous les mouvements des âmes qui l'entourent. S'il est doué, en outre, du don de l'expression, il sera un écrivain de génie. Il n'y aura rien d'étonnant à ce qu'un pareil homme soit pessimiste ; sa nature suprasensible répondra douloureusement à tous les chocs de l'existence ; et du fait même qu'il jouit avec intensité de la lumière du soleil, il frissonnera avec angoisse devant les ténèbres de la mort.

' Tel nous paraît M. Hardy.'

It resolves itself into the old question : Is the artist a teacher ? He ' attunes the soul to high states of feeling,' Lord Morley has reminded us ; ' the direct lesson is often as naught.' But the indirect method of teaching is often the most effectual ; and we hold, with Wordsworth, that every great poet is a teacher. For himself, he wished to be considered this or nothing. ' To ' console the afflicted ; to add sunshine to daylight by making ' the happy happier ; to teach the young and the gracious of ' every age to see, to think, and feel, and therefore to become ' more actively and more sincerely virtuous '—that was his vocation : a vocation inseparable from the higher forms of art. M. Hedgcock speaks of Meredith's doctrine of effort, of self-sacrifice, of developement, in a word of life, as ' quasi-chrétienne.'

' Quasi-chrétienne.' The epithet is well chosen ; for whatever else the attitude of the pessimist is or is not, it is foreign to the spirit of the New Testament—so foreign that it is not a little surprising to see the Churches and churchmen, those even from whom better things might have been looked for, accepting it. That life is a misery, that the times are ' very evil '—only in a decadent age and by decadents is this felt. The times are not ' very evil.' If they are not ' very good ' they are bettering and in a fair way to better : if we will help in the work of their betterment, we must recognise in them at least a foundation of goodness on which this work may be built. The first Christians lived in a world whose evils they denounced unsparingly and somewhat undiscriminatingly ; the last charge that can be brought against them is that of opportunism or compromise. But their heaven was not in the past, but in the future : they would have regarded despair as faithlessness ; for them, as for their Founder, the kingdom of God was ' at hand.'

Art. VI.—CHANGES OF CURRENT IN POLITICAL THOUGHT.

1. *Syndicalism and Labour.* By Sir Arthur Clay, Bart. London: Murray. 1911.
2. *The Province of the State.* By Sir Roland K. Wilson, Bart. London: P. S. King and Son. 1911.
3. *The Future of England.* By the Hon. George Peel. London: Macmillan. 1911.

The analogy between the body politic and the body physical has been drawn so frequently as to have become almost a platitude. Attention has chiefly been paid to structural analogy: the highways with blood-vessels, telegraph wires with nerves, etc.; but it holds good to an even more remarkable degree in the psychological comparison between the two. Here indeed the comparison almost ceases to be an analogy, and becomes an identity: for the thoughts of the nation as a whole are not merely analogous to, but are the very same thoughts that occupy the minds of individuals.

Now it is very common to under-estimate the heuristic value of the apparent platitude that, among individuals, it is possible to think of only one thing at a time. The same is true of nations. The thoughts of the nation are represented in its politics; and in the sphere of politics at any particular moment one subject is usually fixed in the centre of attention while others exist more vaguely close at hand, ready at any moment to become the topic of first importance, and, after a spell of attraction, to retreat again, permanently or temporarily, into the background. The natural limitations of the mind constitute the natural limitations of politics. Insurance is not more necessary now than it was ten years ago. Then why does everybody talk about it now, while nobody talked about it then? Because ten years ago other things were being talked about, which in themselves occupied full attention. Old age pensions is another case, in which the principle was agreed to be desirable by both parties, and became law as soon as it was really before the public mind. For years it had been hanging in the background of the political consciousness; but not until the year it was passed did it succeed in attaining the full glare of public attention, in competition with the innumerable other questions still hovering about unsuccessfully in the shade. One or two of these are brought out each

session and passed into law: being selected partly by chance, partly by the pressure of popular clamour, partly by their intrinsic importance. Most of them are represented by voluntary associations and societies, whose chief business is to press their individual propaganda before the attention of Parliament: and the success of one of these means the temporary failure of the rest.

The limitation of political consciousness to one or two questions at a time, changing from session to session, is paralleled by its limitation to one or two particular *classes* of questions, changing from generation to generation. The period of the Napoleonic wars was characterised by a singularly small output of social legislation. The mind of the country, being turned to foreign politics, was naturally not open to discussion of reforms at home. So prominent is this truth in fact, that the German government is often suspected of desiring to bring on a foreign war in order to arrest the advance of their indigenous socialism. The termination of war in 1815 left the country free to attend to affairs at home once more. It soon settled down; and then for several decades the *class* of questions to which attention veered, was the breaking-up of the remnants of feudalism, the removal of all unnecessary restrictions upon liberty, the desire of equal justice for all, and the equal rights of every man to live his own life in his own way. Typical of this period were the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, reform bills, abolition of colonial slavery, free trade, ballot, reduction of taxation, Church disestablishment, etc. A large number of these and similar measures passed into law—but a great many did not. While yet they were in the penumbra of political consciousness, another great movement in public opinion had set in; and before their turn came to be set up as the cynosures of a session they had been swept right away from the arena of practical politics, and replaced by a new group of questions of altogether different order. The individualist era lasted something over half a century, gradually growing in strength, reaching a climax, and then as gradually declining again. It was supplanted by what we are often told is a socialistic era: and indeed, if we compare it with its predecessor, we cannot fail to admit that all its legislation is markedly collectivist. If any particular date must be singled out for the initiation of the new régime, it would probably be most accurate to connect it with the commencement of national education. The huge expenditure of public money for public purposes is the characteristic of the great majority of measures pressed forward in this new era. The movement has gone on steadily increasing. We would not

venture to speculate whether it has yet reached a climax ; but perhaps an analysis of various modern tendencies will help us to guess to what part of the political horizon we should look for the dawn of the young movement which will, in the natural course of events, take the place of existing lines of legislation. Doubtless that new movement is at this moment well under weigh in the midst of us. The roots of the collectivist era extend far back into the individualist era. Since 1833 the State had made a grant for educational purposes. Factory bills and ten-hour days became law in the forties. But this legislation was only subsidiary and overshadowed by individualism : not until the succeeding era did it reach the importance and massiveness which render it distinctive of the times. So too, in our own era, we may look among the movements that are secondary but gaining strength, for an indication of what is to succeed it. Before doing so however an examination must be made of the tendencies of our own and the preceding era, and the causes which bring about a shifting of public attention.

The works under review are admirable aids in the performance of such an analysis. Sir Roland Wilson and Sir Arthur Clay agree in their stout partisanship of the principle of individualism. But here the resemblance between their books terminates. Sir Roland Wilson draws up a philosophic exposition of individualist principles, while Sir Arthur Clay devotes himself to an analysis of syndicalism, which he justly regards as a movement eminently typical of modern collectivism. Mr. Peel endeavours to analyse the past as a means to foreseeing the future. Let us first consider Sir Roland's programme.

The author would be the first to admit that it has not the remotest chance of popular acceptance. A theory of State functions would have been regarded as an undertaking of the first importance in the middle of the last century. At the present time, it is likely to arouse only slight interest. If it had been written in the middle of last century, it might have been hailed as a great work, and brought wide celebrity to its author. It has qualities that are likely to succeed highly in a sympathetic environment, but that are likely to be altogether neglected in an unfavourable environment. In aim and method it closely resembles the early edition of Herbert Spencer's 'Social 'Statics,' and would probably have enjoyed a success similar to the success of that work if it had been published at the same time. But at the present time it is likely to secure unqualified approval from scarcely anyone. Sir Roland's views cut across party lines, taking a little from each party and rejecting a great

deal more from both. A combination of Church Disestablishment, Land Nationalisation, municipal trading, and opposition to State education and State activity will hardly attract a solitary disciple. Everyone who reads this book is sure to find much in it that he disagrees with; and will find it expressed in vigorous and uncompromising language. Nevertheless any reader who is not blinded to the merits of the work by the mere fact of disagreement on certain points, will find much that is valuable and stimulating, and cannot fail to be struck by the virile independence of thought that is characteristic of the best individualist writings. But just as, during the individualist era, nearly all the works which acquired fame were individualistic in tone (Mill, Spencer, etc.), so in the collectivist era the most famous productions are of collectivist character, and individualistic works have no chance of becoming famous.

What is the cause of the alteration that has come over political questions? Without doubt, it is twofold. In the first place, there is the natural tendency, apparently inevitable in a progressive community, to become bored with certain classes of questions and to seek out new spheres of interest. In the second place, a few decades of legislation on certain lines goes a long way towards realising the aims of its promoters. The chief evils which they fought against have been removed; those which remain are less felt, and the public become taken up with other social evils which they now begin to feel more. The individualist era was devoted to the break-up of the remnants of feudalism. After some decades, this object was so far achieved that feudalism, though not completely extinguished, was reduced to such insignificant proportions that its oppressiveness was no longer felt, and that it ceased to stimulate adequate driving force for an important counter-movement. And, at the same time, new energy was gathering for the initiation of a new movement. After the removal of vexatious restrictions on individual liberty, it transpired that the grievance now most acutely felt was the inequality in the distribution of wealth and in the means for leading a happy and satisfactory life. The new type of legislation, therefore, is mainly directed towards removing that inequality. Outside the political arena, the movement is seen in the growing strength of the trade unions, and in their determination to transfer to their members as large a share as possible in the proceeds of their business. Inside the political arena, the tendency has been towards the taxation of the whole community, and especially of the richest section, for the purpose of subsidising the sections whose needs are greatest. In both cases, the fundamental

purpose is to transfer wealth from those who have it to those who are without it, and thereby to bring about a general levelling. To put it coarsely, but truly, there is a general scramble to secure as large a proportion as possible of the national goods.

We have called the age collectivist—a name justified by comparison with the preceding age. But it does not seem to us that collectivism rightly signifies the essence of the movement. For collectivism implies a community of wealth, a joint ownership as opposed to individual ownership. It is true that, in the transference of wealth from rich to poor, collectivism is one of the methods adopted. The State becomes corporate owner of what previously was privately owned. But this is only an incident in the redistribution of wealth. The object is to make the rich poorer, and the poor richer—socialism and syndicalism are only aspects of this fundamental fact; one working through Parliament and the other mainly outside Parliament. There is no general collectivist feeling as such, no objection to individual ownership, but only a demand for greater equalisation.

What are the rights and wrongs of this tendency? The rich rely mainly on the argument that, the wealth being theirs by lawful title, it is immoral and unjust to take it away from them by superior force. They appeal to the first principles of morality. The poor, on the other hand, affirm that their alleged lawful title has a contestable origin in the social injustice of former times; they argue that a baby born of poor parents is as much entitled to a fair share of the world's goods as a baby born of rich parents: since neither baby has done anything whatever to deserve wealth or suffer poverty, and is in no way responsible for its antecedents. On whichever side the right may lie, it is quite clear that the practical victory is for the most part with the poorer classes. The rich, in the nature of things, are few as compared with the poor. When once the question of wealth was raised, it was inevitable that the sessional measures should be generally directed beneficially to the poorer classes. But there is not the slightest reason for believing—nay, there are the strongest reasons for not believing—that the movement will continue till it attains the dead flat socialism feared by many. Individualism was dead long before it came near its ideal. Republicanism and disestablishment were never reached, though for long they were the most dreaded developements of the individualist régime. The removal of the harshest restrictions was all that was really effected in the individualist era. So too we may infer that collectivism—

we call it so, for want of a better name—will pass away and make room for something else more urgent, as soon as the most glaring inequalities have been done away with. The relief is likely to be furthered in two ways: (1) the improvement in the position of the poor will quickly take the sting out of the demand for change (2) the diminished ostentation of the rich, either from actual impoverishment or much more from a dislike of ostentation itself, growing parallel with the movement against inequality, will deprive public feeling of the material for a striking comparison between rich and poor. We hold most emphatically that the degeneration cry is baseless: our society is far too securely founded to be overthrown by even a large amount of unwise legislation. If bad legislation ruined nations, how indeed could any nation ever have survived? Man as usual is prone to over-estimate his own powers in the universe, and to conceive that the forces which he wields and understands are the fundamental forces of Nature. In truth the deepest of Nature's laws are yet unguessed, and regulate our community with far greater power than any human effort could rival.

> 'Men are the sport of circumstances, when
> The circumstances seem the sport of men.' *

When the most striking contrasts in wealth have been toned down, the impulsion towards collectivist legislation will weaken; and political attention will be grasped by a new class of questions, selected from those hitherto hovering in the background, ready to oust the present type at its first sign of decrepitude. Whatever our views, we must look forward anxiously to that time. Legislation which divides the country into bitterly hostile parties, setting class against class, rich against poor, may be a necessary phase, but, if so, is a deplorable necessity. We have all learnt that a house divided against itself cannot stand. Internal dissension is a source of weakness that is equally dangerous, whether we regard our position among European nations or our hope of real social improvement at home. In more barbarous days, the hostility might have broken out into civil war; and, though there is now no danger of that, yet the discord tends to produce a feebleness of concerted action which is in the last degree injurious.

It will be useful to run over the principles which would regulate a purely individualistic state, such as is described by Sir Roland Wilson, and then to note the movement of our own time, which is described by Sir Arthur Clay.

* Don Juan.

The individualist ideal is that the State should be nothing else than a pure justice-enforcing association. The term is ambiguous, for socialists profess that they themselves have no other object. Bentham's proposition that 'Justice is the end 'of government' means much or little according to the definition we give to the word 'justice.' Mr. Auberon Herbert held that the association ought to be purely voluntary, even to the paying of taxation; it being understood that anyone who chose might remain outside, but would be deprived of legal protection or the advantages of a government. Herbert Spencer held the same doctrine in early years; but he discarded it, and in 'The Principles of Ethics' laid down the law that 'Every man 'is free to do that which he wills, provided he infringes not the 'equal freedom of any other man.' The formula is admirably suited to an age which was bent upon breaking up all feudal restrictions. It limited State activity to the maintenance of justice at home and the resistance of aggression abroad. Sir Roland Wilson has no fault to find with it: he is in the main a Spencerian, though in many matters of detailed application of the law he differs from the conclusions of the great philosopher. The condition of mind leading to individualism is in such fundamental opposition to that which leads to discipleship that it is not surprising to find few modern individualists subscribing in full to Spencer's law. Sir Roland's modifications are in the direction of somewhat greater extension of State activities than is prescribed by Spencer. He agrees that the chief functions are the maintenance of judicial tribunals, a police force, and military and naval armaments. On the latter point he is again in agreement with Spencer on the important subject of compulsory military service. Both Sir Roland Wilson and Spencer affirm that, where the safety of the country is at stake, compulsory service is not only admissible, but a moral duty devolving upon all citizens. The integrity of the country must necessarily take precedence of any theory of government functions; for an infringement of that integrity by a successful invasion renders the people subject to dictation from abroad, in complete disregard of their wishes or theories. Although compulsory military service is not to be opposed on grounds of interference with liberty, yet on practical grounds it is to be strongly deprecated in ordinary times. In general it has been found that efficiency in all social services is obtained by division of labour. Instead of everyone doing everything indifferently, each person makes one pursuit peculiarly his own; by dint of continual practice and experience he becomes a master in his particular line, and

satisfies all his other requirements by bartering his own productions against those of specialists in every other department of industry. Efficiency goes hand in hand with division of labour; and in the most important of all occupations, that of national defence, it is more imperative than anywhere else.

It is often argued against this view that, since military service occasionally entails danger and death on behalf of the country, it is unjust that those sufferings should be borne by a few, but they should be shared by the whole nation. We would reply that efficiency of defence is the first, most important, and only principle to be considered; and that if that defence is best served, as we believe, by a specialised professional class who devote their whole lives to attaining proficiency in it, no sentimental considerations of abstract justice should be allowed to interfere with it. We readily agree that the entire nation should be ready to bear those risks, if called upon in a crisis to do so; but we emphatically deny that the mere object of equalising risks is worthy to affect our counsels as to securing the maximum efficiency. Indeed we must assume that all worthy men are equally prepared to take risks; and, making this assumption, we should dismiss from our minds all further talk of risk or danger.

Moreover, it is not true, as is suggested, that the life of a soldier is a harder life, or has greater disadvantages, than that of a civilian. The people who go into it are animated by the same feeling as causes people to enter any other profession. It offers an opening for a career; all openings are crowded with applicants in just proportion to the advantages they have to offer. In the services they are filled, not from classes more patriotic than other people, but from the classes which stand nearest to them: in the same way that a man born in Sheffield is likely to become a metal-worker. The advantages of the profession are generally weighed, in quite a businesslike manner, against those offered by one or two other openings which are equally handy. Among officers no doubt a certain feeling of glory and an improved social status are part of the inducements in addition to the cash received. Among nearly all young men, moreover, the excitement of a war, quite apart from patriotism, is intrinsically attractive, and far outbalances the thought of risks.

'He jests at scars who never felt a wound.'

The great majority of youths would rush into a war with eagerness from the mere love of excitement; and when they are encouraged, and looked upon as patriotic and glorious, naturally

the incentive is tremendous. The dangers of the military profession are fully compensated by the rewards. We are therefore at liberty to confine ourselves solely to the immediate question of efficiency in national defence, unembarrassed by any other question of justice, personal liberty, inequality of sacrifice, etc. And for efficiency, division of labour is practically a universal advantage. Masses of ill-trained troops will never be able to compete with a small well-trained army, any more than the Persians could withstand the Greeks at Marathon. Let us hope to be preserved from a public militia such as that stigmatised by Dryden in 'Cymon and Iphigenia':

> 'Mouths without hands, maintained at vast expense,
> In peace a charge, in war a weak defence.
> Stout once a month they march, a blustering band,
> And ever but in time of need at hand.'

When compulsory service is advocated as a means of improving the physical condition of the people, it has to be judged on quite different principles, and infraction of individual liberty may very properly be urged against it. The matter is then on a par with the numerous other matters which are supposed to be good for the community; and the question arises whether they should be legally enforced. On this point, the individualist principle appears to be strongly fortified by various considerations. In the first place many people hold that the military training is not beneficial, but injurious physically, intellectually, and morally. Physically, they point to the prevalence of weakened hearts among soldiers, which is not improbably due to drilling. The natural posture of man is not the military posture—which indeed is highly artificial—but a slightly stooping posture. Intellectually, it is argued that young men not only lose valuable time in business, but that at a peculiarly susceptible age they contract habits of excitement and restlessness which render them permanently inefficient and discontented in the office life they will afterwards have to lead. Morally, it is condemned by witnessing its results in a country like France. The *apaches* are said to be almost invariably men who have lately completed their military training. Conscription acts as a school for fostering ruffianism: and the outbreak is particularly apt to occur by reaction when the strong arm of discipline is removed. There may be something in all these arguments; but were they none of them sound, it would still be unwise to introduce our ideas of social improvement in the department where efficiency alone ought to be the guiding consideration. We must not submit to a diminution in our

defensive efficiency on any grounds whatever; nor to the formation of a citizen army which would give the appearance without the reality of defensive power, more particularly when the reasons alleged are widely disputed, not only by the general public, but by military officers of the highest rank and experience.

We have not set out to criticise compulsory military service in its general aspects. If we had, we should have to consider its effects upon naval recruiting, its tendency to diminish war as affirmed by John Stuart Mill, and also by the modern socialists. It is enough for us here to have considered its bearings on the general question of the province of the State.

The maintenance of public offices, a colonial office, a treasury, etc., is an obvious necessity. Not so obvious is Sir Roland's heading for 'the custody and maintenance of dangerous or 'derelict individuals.' Criminals, of course, have to be included in the police department. Lunatics must be looked after, at least so long as they are dangerous. The maintenance of paupers is still held by a few as being altogether a perversion of State functions. It is useless to reply to these few that it would be barbarous to allow the indigent to starve. No one for a moment suggests such a thing. But it is an open question whether their protection should be derived from State funds or private charity. Private charity maintains hospitals to protect the diseased: why should it not also protect the poor? If the State, as a State, allows the diseased to die, why should it not allow the paupers to starve? Disease, in fact, is less often due to misconduct than pauperism, and its claim to relief is greater. Hospitals have greater claims to State support than workhouses; and there is no reason save the tradition of our existing organisations why one should be dependent and the other independent of the State.

We now come to the list of what Sir Roland Wilson describes as 'minor and optional State functions.' Of these the first is standardisation. It is the chief business of the State to enforce contracts; and this enforcement requires that the terms of the contract should be precise and definite—which can only be achieved by reference to established standards. A large proportion of contracts are concerned with the number, weight, and dimensions of commodities, and the fixing of unit standards of these measures becomes almost necessary. We agree that the State is within its limits when it merely specifies exact definition of certain measures in legal use; but we hold that it travels altogether beyond its proper limits when it ordains that those measures *shall* be used in commercial transactions.

There is a danger that the State may misuse its power in order to establish the metric system.

The metric system appeals to the metaphysical instincts of mankind. It is of that beautiful and seductive simplicity which attracts theorists in particular, who desire to force the manifold diversity of practical facts into the nicely balanced rotundity of an artificial system. Thus the length of one metre was selected as being the ten-millionth part of the quarter of the terrestrial meridian. The litre, the gramme etc., are derived from exceedingly simple relationships with the metre. The whole offers unrivalled facility of calculation, and simplicity of acquisition. But unfortunately ease of calculation is a wholly secondary attribute in the use of weights and measures; and the metric system is entirely unsuited to the retail transactions which form the bulk of business dealings, owing to the fact that it takes ten as the radix number, and ten is not divisible by either three or four without running into fractions. The adoption of ten as the basis of our system of numeration is due to the fact that primitive man was in the habit of counting on his ten fingers; and larger figures were therefore naturally estimated in multiples of ten. But in actual business it is exceedingly common that dimensions of articles have to be divided by a half, a third, or a quarter, and it is exceedingly inconvenient when the result of such a division has to be expressed as a fraction. We find therefore, in our naturally developed system of weights and measures, that the number twelve is in far greater requisition than ten; for it can be exactly divided by two, three, four, and six; while ten can only be exactly divided by two and five. The facility of business is enhanced much more by the avoidance of fractions than by the apparent simplicity of the metric system. If any alteration is made at all, it should be in our system of numeration. We should abandon ten altogether, and by introducing two new figures for ten and eleven, we should write twelve as 10; and our multiplication table would be as simple as before. By the introduction of the duodecimal system, our theory would be harmonised with our practice: the maximum ease of calculation would be attained, and there would be the minimum employment of fractions. The introduction of the decimal system, which proposes on the other hand to harmonise our practice with our theory, would be a permanent obstacle to the true line of improvement.*

---

* See Article on British Weights and Measures and the Metric System, Edinburgh Review for October 1910.

There are many other modes of criticism upon the metric system. Why should we take as our unit so fanciful a basis as the ten-millionth part of a quarter of the meridian? What possible advantage is there, beyond the flattering of our desire for theoretic beauty, in making our unit of length dependent upon the Earth's meridian? It is of the first practical importance that the unit of length should be a fixed, unalterable, exact, and easily ascertained quantity. The Earth's meridian has none of these qualities. It is not fixed, because the Earth slowly changes its volume. It is not exact, because every improvement in our instruments brings some change in the earlier estimates of its length. Indeed the constant change of estimates has already caused the abandonment of any attempt to maintain the relation. It is not easily ascertainable; because only specially trained men of science with expensive instruments can ascertain it. In short this attempt at theoretic perfection is accompanied with every kind of practical disadvantage.

Finally, there remains the fact that the State has no right to order its use, even were its disadvantages far less than we have described. Lord Melbourne's question, 'Can't you let it 'alone?' ought to be asked of every proposal for legislation that interferes with the habits of the people. If it is in reality more convenient to them to use the metric system, they will use it without compulsion. It *is* in fact more convenient to one class,—namely, the men of science, and they *do* use it, without being compelled by law to do so. It is true that they are apt to think that what suits them must necessarily suit everybody else; that is a natural but fallacious method of thought, from which men of science are no more free than the public at large; Merchants, dealing in foreign trade, occasionally state that their business is seriously handicapped by the necessity of converting continental measures into British measures over each transaction. To that we reply, firstly, that it is a monstrous suggestion to change the entire habits of the British nation for the private convenience of a small class of merchants, not usually reputed poor; and, secondly, that if their business cannot rise to so simple an operation as transferring one measure into another with practised rapidity, they stamp themselves with such hopeless stupidity that every lover of efficiency and every upholder of British intelligence must look forward with eagerness to their speedy bankruptcy.

Registration and other minor State functions are noted by Sir Roland. The older individualists objected to the census, as inquisitorial and unjustified; but the objection has little force

in our day, so long as the information demanded is used for no other purpose than that of preparing statistical data.

On the question of State education Sir Roland is perfectly logical. It is unreasonable to educate starving children; if you educate, you must feed. The question, as usually put, is between State-education and no education. This, of course, is a mis-statement: the issue is between State education and private education; for in these times of continually increasing prosperity of the lower classes, probably only a small proportion would ever remain uneducated. And so long as we have work of a low kind to be done, it is just as well to have people unrefined by education to do it. The idea of equal opportunity for all is just one of those metaphysical demands for perfection to come out of imperfection, that we have lately criticised. Since there is only room for a few at the top of the tree, and necessity for a great many at the bottom, why is everyone to be trained to aim at the top? The result can only be disappointment and unhappy lives for the great majority; and there is very little good to weigh against it. Those who, starting from the bottom, do reach the top, are often very little better than the people who would otherwise have been there. So long as there exists a certain natural fluidity between classes, the cry for equality of opportunity is founded, not upon hard facts, but upon a sentimental theory which in metaphysics would land us in the absurdities of a Plato or a Leibnitz.

Sir Roland condemns State patronage of science, art, and literature. In the main he is probably right; though where some scientific research is likely to culminate in effects of immediate and obvious utility, it seems unwise to condemn State assistance altogether. Again, he objects to hereditary titles: and advocates that the head of the State should be empowered to bestow life-titles only, on persons who have displayed merit in either politics or administration. There is much to be said for such a view, though we are unable to agree with it. The bestowal of honours on workers in science, art, and literature is not a matter which comes within the province of a government. Politicians are not competent to judge who most deserve honours in these spheres, and popular acclamation is the worst guide. Moreover the honours now accorded in these spheres are invariably of lower rank than are accorded for services of equal value in other spheres. But a still stronger reason exists. Science and the fine arts are essentially individualistic in method. Authority is studiously banished from them; any introduction of a hierarchy into them would be fatal to the spirit of originality and

independence on which their progress depends. Still more detrimental would be the establishment of an incentive to please the authorities, who throughout history have always shown themselves signally incompetent to pick out the great men of their time. A desire for fame is not the kind of spirit that carries forward the civilisation of the world. There is needed rather the type of man who will carry on his work, not only without fame, but in spite of infamy.

After completing his theory of State-functions, Sir Roland goes on to discuss the various writers and organised associations which oppose socialism. Of these, by far the most important position is naturally accorded to Herbert Spencer. 'The Man versus the State' is the best popular statement of the objections to socialism that has ever been written, or is ever likely to be written.* The part 'Justice' in vol. ii. of 'The Principles of Ethics' is similarly the leading philosophic exposition of individualism. In France the leading writer is Mr. Leroy-Beaulieu; and Sir Arthur Clay's abridged translation of his chief work remains a standard treatise for anti-socialism. The voluntaryism of Mr. Auberon Herbert is considered; and also the individualism of Mr. J. H. Levy and the Personal Rights Association, which would be the best and most disinterested of all the anti-socialist societies, if it did not hamper its utility by its senseless opposition to vivisection. The other societies in general are leagues of threatened interests, far more offended by attacks on property than on liberty, and in some cases allied to tariff reform, or compulsory military service, or other restrictions of liberty. The British Constitution Association appears to be the most influential, and the best, of these societies. But Sir Roland with some point criticises its name. The name can only be understood to mean a rigid adherence to the forms of government prevailing in the past. And what is there, he asks, in common between the maintenance of personal liberty and the fantastic defence of a non-existent British Constitution? A further difficulty is raised by the fact that this association has formally espoused the principle of the Referendum, a scheme completely at variance with the constitutional practice of the past. In every respect, 'unconstitutional' would as correctly describe this society's activities as 'constitutional.' Indeed, the name itself is so inappropriate that no other reason can be imagined for its adoption than that of attracting the support of Conservative party opinion

* It is now published at 6d. by the Rationalist Press Association.

throughout the country. More futile, however, is the programme of the Centre Party Union, whose aim is to get rid of parties, and whose method of beginning is to create an altogether new party, in addition to those existing!

It is a pertinent question whether these societies do more good or harm to the cause they advocate. There are at least half-a-dozen of them in existence, but they all appear to be totally ineffective for any other purpose than that of drafting off the superfluous energies and thereby relieving the feelings of the gentlemen who join them. But there are ulterior results not so easily seen. We have already signified our belief that the collectivist era will pass away in due time, not by a reversion to individualism, but by progress to some new set of ideas, when the general question of socialism and individualism will sink into unimportance. The anti-socialist societies do all that they can to keep the collectivist questions before public attention. Though their solutions are individualistic, the class of questions they cry out about are those of socialist import: they tend to keep these questions before the country. The real death-blow to collectivist legislation will come from those who advocate altogether new subjects, whose great importance will drive out existing topics from the legislative arena. The anti-socialist societies merely add to the din which keeps out of hearing the still small voice which undoubtedly is now already among us.

Not only do these societies increase the obstacles in the way of any new movement, but they more directly defeat their own purpose in another manner. The collectivist legislation of the day, whether it be right or wrong, is assuredly demanded by the people, while a real system of socialism is equally beyond doubt repellent to them. The anti-socialist societies find one of their main occupations in flinging the word 'socialist' at each new turn of legislation that they dislike. The appellation is usually strictly accurate; but the use of it on any and every occasion with reference to legislation which the public look upon as harmless or beneficial, cheapens the word, and makes people think that after all Socialism may not be so very terrible: if this, that and the other apparently harmless laws are continually being stigmatised as raging Socialism, why then, what is the danger in Socialism? The word depreciates through constant use, and the thing it represents ceases to frighten. It seems not improbable that the anti-socialist societies are providing Socialism with an extensive free advertisement, and are robbing it of its terrors by ceaselessly accustoming the public

to the idea that our peaceful and prosperous era is a living example of what is to be expected from it.

We leave now the individualist régime to consider the aspect of our present régime, which has been so well described by Sir Arthur Clay in his book on 'Syndicalism and Labour.' We have described the dominant note of the present time as an attempt to redress inequalities of wealth. In Syndicalism we witness an attempt, altogether outside politics, on the part of the working classes to seize from the higher classes a larger share of the joint income than they now obtain. The method by which the seizure is to be effected is that of the general strike. The origin of the policy is said to be found in Mirabeau's reference to 'Ce peuple dont la seule immobilité serait formidable.' At the congress of the International Labour Association in 1868, the declaration was made 'that if pro-'duction were arrested for a certain time society could not 'exist, and that it was only necessary for producers to cease 'to produce in order to make government impossible.' What is to happen when this desirable end has been achieved we are not told. How social life can proceed in a state of anarchy is not apparent. Sir Arthur's main objection to syndicalism is grounded on its immorality. We agree, in so far as morality is concerned, that a general strike is much on a par with civil war. A successful general strike would bring famine and starvation to the population in a few days: and those who kill their fellow-men by starvation are not better than those who kill them with swords. It is inadequate to reply that the worker has a perfect right to stand idle if he chooses, and that he is in no way committing a crime comparable to one who shoots his neighbour. The distinction is mere hairsplitting. If a man stands on a river bank and watches another drowning within his reach but refuses to stretch out his hand to save him, he is as much guilty of that man's death as if he had actively held his head under the water. An example still more closely applicable to the present case would be that of an engine-driver who had a grudge against the passengers in his train, because they were richer than he. He might settle this grudge by running his train past hostile signals at full speed into some obstacle. That would correspond to the active murder of civil war. Or he might just sit down on his tender and do nothing, letting the train continue to travel at full speed without power of stopping. This corresponds to the general strike. Will anybody say that the one course is more moral than the other?

But the syndicalist may affirm that, since he is the first to

suffer by a general strike, it cannot be iniquitous on his part. Equally it may be answered that the engine-driver is the first to lose his life in the smash for which he is responsible, but that his crime towards the passengers is in no wise affected by that circumstance: nay, it is increased, for he can no longer be punished for it. The analogy between civil war and Syndicalism is complete.

But when we have asserted this, we doubt if the cry of morality is of any further service. If the worker goes on to say that his position is so intolerable as to justify him in destroying society, there is really no further answer to him. If that is his view, we have to deal with an ultimate fact, which is not altered by calling it names. If he carries his view into practice, the net result will be that the nation commits suicide, and there is an end of it. Discussion as to whether suicide is right or wrong is of purely academic interest, on a par with the medieval controversy between realism and nominalism. The fact of practical interest is the cessation of social life; and it behoves us now to inquire how far the movement has proceeded in actual deeds, beyond vague words and threats.

In France, the highest point has been reached. At Limoges in 1895 was founded the Confédération Générale du Travail (commonly known as the C.G.T.) for the specific purpose of adopting Syndicalism. In 1902 it was joined by the Federation of Labour Exchanges, and since that time has exercised a continually increasing influence on industrial disputes in France. It still represents only about one-third of the Trade Unions in France; but Sir Arthur Clay believes that a success would quickly add to its strength, which in any case is considerable for so young an association. In 1909 it brought about the postal strike which threatened for a day or two even the stability of the French Republic. It was estimated that the Post Office lost £40,000 a day, while millions of letters and hundreds of thousands of telegrams were undelivered. M. Clemenceau, the Prime Minister, firmly adhered to the principle that the Government could not tolerate a strike among its own employees, and legal measures were taken for the dissolution of the Postmen's Syndicate. The C.G.T. immediately called for a general strike in support of the postmen, and it was announced that nearly 90 unions had agreed to fall into line. Nevertheless the movement failed: as prophesied by the secretary of the C.G.T., 'the masses were not yet ready for a general strike.' The Government took energetic action, dismissed the strikers, and appointed new men: in a few days, the C.G.T. were compelled to declare the General Strike at an end. It seems likely

however that the good effect following the active measures of the Government was mitigated by the restoration some months later of the dismissed employees.

In March 1910 a strike among the 'Inscrits Maritimes' again furnished the C.G.T. with opportunity for fomenting disorder. Again however the Government acted with vigour. The men nearly all returned to work, leaving a situation described as 'a strike without strikers,' and no harm was done. The next occasion for interference was in the great Railway Strike of 1910. In May of that year about 10,000 men struck, throwing the traffic completely out of organisation. The matter did not come to a crisis however till October; when not only was great inconvenience inflicted upon the public, but acts of violence and sabotage were committed. At this time M. Briand was at the head of the Government, and acted with an energy that soon disarmed the virulence of the movement. The expedient which he adopted was remarkable for its boldness. He issued a mobilisation order, the effect of which was to place under the control of the War Minister all railwaymen liable to service: those who failed to attend becoming military defaulters. He thus prepared to defeat the strikers by their own men—a measure, the courage of which becomes manifest when we reflect that the Government were placing arms in the hands of men who had already resorted to anti-social violence. The plan succeeded, and in a few days the Railwaymen's Strike Committee decided upon a resumption of work. M. Briand then embarked upon a campaign directed against the nefarious power of the C.G.T. He tendered his resignation, and returned to power with increased authority; but the intrigues against him were continued, and in March 1911 he was succeeded by a new ministry. M. Monis, the new Prime Minister, began by granting remissions of penalties to those concerned in the railway strike: a policy of weakness, which Sir Arthur Clay regards as of gloomy foreboding for the future.

Syndicalism, which has its origin in France, is by no means confined to that country. In Sweden capital and labour are each represented by powerful bodies; and the National Labour Organisation represents about two-thirds of the organised labour of the country. An industrial quarrel developed on the 4th of August 1909 into a general strike, in which the number of men thrown out of work was estimated at 200,000. Unlike the French strikes however it was perfectly orderly, and special dispensations from striking were granted to men 'concerned with the care of sick persons or living animals,

'or with lighting, water supply, or sanitation.' The strike leaders moreover prohibited the sale of drink, and assisted the police in the maintenance of order. The Government therefore were not called upon to interfere, and the movement was able to run its course to a natural termination. What was this natural termination? For a time immense inconvenience was inflicted on trade and the public in general. But, almost at once, private enterprise enrolled a 'Public Security Brigade' (Frivillige skyddsvaren) to carry out the most necessary of social services. It was strongly supported from all classes. 'Counts and barons, military and naval officers, professional and 'business men, engineers, clerks, students from the universities 'and technical schools, alike volunteered their services. . . . . 'It is an object-lesson in the capacity of the upper and middle 'classes to meet such an emergency.' The measure succeeded and the strike was broken. As Sir Arthur Clay observes: 'In face of a community virile and energetic enough to take 'upon itself and adequately perform such daily work as is 'indispensable, syndicalism is impotent, so long—and the 'reservation is of great importance—*as material order is* '*preserved*.' This must be the chief concern of the Government, who must not hesitate to call out the troops or take any other measures required to effect it.

Syndicalism has likewise found its way into Italy. The most important strike that has yet occurred in that country broke out at Parma on May Day 1908. The dispute originated between the Agrarian Association, which represented the local proprietors and tenants, and the agricultural labourers backed by the Socialists. The labourers went on strike to the reputed number of 40,000; and violent methods were employed from the first. On the 19th of June a general strike of all trades was proclaimed in Parma, and the Chamber of Labour called upon the whole of Italy to join in. Gradually however the crisis became less acute. On the 30th of June work was resumed in Parma by all but the agriculturists, and in the course of another month the whole dispute had died away; the net result being that 40,000 men were kept out of work at the most critical season of the year, incalculable damage was inflicted on the landed proprietors of Parma, and the conditions of labour remained almost exactly as they were before.

Spain has not escaped contact with the Syndicalist movement. In the summer of 1909 a discontent which appeared to be very general culminated in elaborate arrangements for a general strike, to commence simultaneously in Madrid and other large towns. The government were equal to the occasion however,

martial law was declared, and the Socialist leader, Señor Iglesias, with several others was arrested, and the Socialist headquarters closed; with the result that only in Barcelona did the outbreak actually occur on the 28th of July 1909. It was brief, but violent. Nearly 100 persons were killed and 1000 wounded, 36 churches and convents were burnt down, and incendiarism was rampant. Bridges were blown up, telegraph wires cut, electrical and gas works destroyed, and railways torn up. The troops soon suppressed the revolt, and on the 2nd of August work was resumed. Señor Ferrer, who was tried and convicted of having instigated the revolt, was executed on the 13th of October: an act which 'raised a storm of angry 'protest throughout Europe and South America.' The Government acted with great vigour, and quelled what might have been a disturbance of the highest gravity.

In Germany Syndicalism appears to be unknown. The powerful hand of the Government, backed by the whole force of the Army, offers little attraction for the new method of agitation in that country. Nor does Sir Arthur make any mention of Syndicalism in the United States. Yet, some time after the publication of his book, there has occurred a striking example of its activity in that country. The American Federation of Labour has of late years 'come to be regarded as representative 'of American Labour.'* It is far from being yet clear what was the relation of Mr. Gompers, president of the Federation, to the crimes confessed by the brothers McNamara. The American 'World' affirms that 'since the Bridge and Structural 'Iron Workers' Strike, with which the McNamaras were 'intimately connected, started in 1906, there have been 113 'outrages involving the sacrifice of 112 lives and of millions 'of dollars.' Finally on the 1st of October 1910 the office of the 'Los Angeles Times' was blown up: and simultaneously two other dynamite attempts were made on the houses of persons who had taken a prominent line in opposition to the trade unions. In short, over a hundred dynamite explosions, 'all 'occurring in shops where the domination of organised labour 'was not recognised,' have left no room for doubt that the outrages proceed from friends of the trade-unions: and the only question at issue is, who has supplied the large funds required? The Federation of Labour has either been cognisant all along of the guilt of the McNamaras or it has failed to control its followers, and has very unadvisedly denounced those responsible for the arrest.

* Times, December 5, 1911.

In Great Britain Syndicalism has not as yet made its appearance. Considerable alarm with reference to it was however raised by the railway strike towards the end of last summer: and there are many indications that the railway trouble is far from being near an end, while a coalminers' strike is a constantly present fear. As to the epidemic of strikes which appeared at the end of last summer, we may perhaps look for a physical cause. It was suggested by a leading scientific journal that the prolonged and excessive heat of the summer might not improbably have affected the nervous organisation of the workers in some manner which, however slight, would suffice to account for the outbreak of the disturbances. The cause here suggested was long ago shown by Buckle to be a truly operative cause in various departments of life; the number of marriages, of suicides, &c., was proved to be dependent on physical events. There appears therefore no inherent improbability that an unusually hot summer should result in abnormal physiological manifestations. But the heat may have contributed, not only as a physiologic but as an economic cause. A strike is at all times a period of great hardship for the strikers. After a spell of very warm weather the hardship is less than at any other time in the year. Men can do without coal, very little lighting is required, food is cheap, privations of all kinds are less felt; add to this that in hot weather the unpleasantness of work is increased, and the attractiveness of idling likewise more conspicuous—and we probably have a fully sufficient explanation of the outcrop of strikes, without seeking for any deeper motive.

There now arises the question as to the proper treatment of Syndicalism. We have to remember in the first place that, as society becomes more advanced, its parts become more and more interdependent. In an animal of low organisation, a large part can be thrown out of work, with only temporary inconvenience to the remainder. A worm cut in half will grow into two new worms; and on amputating the eye of a crayfish, or the tail of a lizard, a new eye and a new tail grow up. But in the case of a human being, advanced organisation is attained at the expense of a more or less complete loss of the power of regeneration of injured parts. Extensive injury to any important organ results, not in recovery, but in death. And so it is with the social organisation. In a primitive form, the failure of one section may not greatly affect the rest. But in an advanced form, the health and continued existence of the whole is altogether dependent upon the proper functioning of all its numerous separate parts. A strike in any one trade may throw the whole of society out of gear. It cannot

therefore be pretended that the workers in any particular trade are entitled to stop work whenever they please, without reference to the rest of the community. The health and existence of the whole community is dependent upon the performance by every one of his proper duties; and the community is entitled to prevent as far as possible any abdication of those duties, when such abdication is of a generally injurious character.

On the other hand, strikes may constitute a natural safety-valve for blowing off the passions of industrial discontent, and it would be in the last degree unwise if the Government were to act so as to block up these safety valves. The hard fact which confronts us is the existence of social discontent. Repression will never cure that discontent except among a decadent people. In a free nation, it can only exacerbate the evil. There are only two practical ways of meeting the discontent; the first is to remedy the cause, by granting the popular demands. This is very often impossible, because the popular demands, being founded on ignorance, cannot be conceded without disaster, or cannot even be conceded at all. The second way is to provide channels by which the overflowing discontent may from time to time relieve itself in a comparatively harmless manner. 'Passion' is always best relieved by conversion into 'action.' Anger is quickly spent by abuse or blows, without which it would have been long harboured. Many instances rise to the mind of the dangerous outburst of feeling which follows long repression. The primitive austerity of Roman manners gave way to an unbridled license and indulgence. And presently the wanton festivals of Bacchus and mysteries of Isis yielded once more to that almost savage asceticism which cropped out in the blackest darkness of the Middle Ages. Nearer our own times we see the same thing. The unnatural puritanism of the Cromwellian age was succeeded by the almost equally unnatural looseness of the Court of Charles II. In France the stern repression exercised in the eighteenth century reacted with the furious outbreak of the French Revolution. In Russia anarchy and repression go hand in hand. But need we multiply instances of a truth so palpable? Is it not a commonplace of pedagogy that a coercive education generally results in a wild reaction?

We are therefore far from seeing in strong measures of the Government any palliative for the evils of Syndicalism. Syndicalism springs from a discontent, whose existence is an unpleasant fact; but given the existence of the fact, it is probably better that it should come straight to the surface than remain seething and unseen. From the Government will be expected

continuous care and watching, rather than repression. As Sir Arthur Clay rightly observes, *order must be maintained*; but within this condition, it would perhaps be wise to give the malcontents as much latitude as possible. The larger the orbits they traverse, the greater will be the relief experienced. The preceding accounts of strikes show that the natural course is for the movement to burst suddenly, and then, if uninterfered with, to wane slowly and die out, with the exhaustion of the passions which gave rise to it. Sir Charles Macara, President of the Employers' Federation in the cotton industry, has recently proposed in the 'Financial Review of Reviews' an industrial court for the settlement of labour disputes. It seems questionable whether the social discontent could be assuaged short of actual industrial warfare; but anything attempting peaceable solutions must be a move in the right direction, if the parties can be induced to abide by its decisions.

Sir Arthur Clay somewhere refers aptly to the 'disease' of Syndicalism. The expression is something more than an analogy; for the instincts upon which anti-social violence is founded may be looked upon as morbid processes in the nervous system. The resemblance is more especially with infectious diseases, for the contagion of Syndicalism is obvious. Now immunity to infectious diseases is acquired only by constant exposure. Nations which have been shielded for any length of time from contact with a disease, succumb with most fatal facility when they are for the first time exposed to it. Consumption and the old-world diseases rapidly decimated the American Indians, who had never previously experienced them. Similarly an outbreak of Syndicalism is likely to be the more malignant, in proportion to the smallness of the previous experience of the nation. The minor strikes which from time to time take place may be looked upon as a vaccination against revolutionary uprisings. Vaccination is always unpleasant and inconvenient; but if the virus of smallpox is about, it is wise to suffer the milder ailment.

Sir Arthur Clay calls upon the middle classes to grapple with the dangers which in his opinion threaten the welfare of the country. He rightly observes that in the past the middle class has been the backbone of the country, the fountain of progress. But surely not merely as a middle class. In all countries the most progressive class has been that which occupies a status just above that of drudging for necessaries. The lowest classes of all, who are kept with their noses to the grindstone, are not progressive. They have no time or energy to think and feel. Nor are the classes which can afford

luxuries progressive, though of course there are many progressive individuals among them. It is the class which is supplied with necessaries, but not with the means of self-indulgence, that has advanced the most. In our past history, this particular social plane has generally been included in the middle classes, and hence the reputation of the latter. But surely this is no longer the case. The better class of artisans —the upper section of the lower classes—now represent the most progressive part of the community, and the middle classes, possibly for ever, are deposed from their pedestal. They suffer in general from a luxuriousness and a love of display that is unbalanced by the traditions and high ideals which are the mainstay of the aristocracy. In the higher classes, it is true, we find everywhere a pretence of knowledge that is not real: a general desire to appear to be clever and to know much: a professed admiration for intelligence, which is not felt at heart. In the middle classes, we find a greater real ignorance, and not even a pretence of knowledge. The most blatant ignorance declares itself unabashed. We have not infrequently been struck in social intercourse with the rarity with which people ever ask questions, when the topic of conversation is somewhat beyond their attainments. It does not arise from lack of interest, but from an ever-present desire to conceal ignorance, and the fear of committing an intellectual *faux pas*. But even this laudable caution does not affect the bulk of the middle classes. If they do not ask questions, it is because they are not intelligent enough to be interested. This soon becomes clear, when by chance they do ask a question which shows not only startling ignorance but a total shamelessness of that ignorance. We doubt therefore whether any response is likely to follow Sir Arthur's appeal to the middle classes. Nevertheless we earnestly trust that his book will be widely read, and the lessons so ably given well taken to heart.

Mr. George Peel's book on the future of England is the sequel to two forerunners on 'The Enemies of England' and 'The Friends of England.' He attempts to look into the future by the aid of principles derived from an analysis of the past. The aim is ambitious; and the conclusions seem to be very fairly drawn, if the method is permissible. We doubt however whether it is permissible. Our future will not be founded solely upon the same factors as have acted in the past. The progress of science not only vastly increases the knowledge of mankind, but also their powers of acting, or affecting their surroundings for their own advantage. The modern civilised world rests upon the shoulders of George Stephenson. Before Stephenson, and

before Watt, no one could have conceived the industrial development which their discoveries made possible. They introduced new factors into man's sphere which profoundly modified his future, and which yet could not have been foreseen. As time goes on, new factors are introduced with greater rather than lesser frequency; the power of mankind advances with an average acceleration; and prophecies of the future, founded upon analysis of the past, are more and more likely to fail. We may compare the progress of a nation with a parabolic curve. A body moving in a parabola would move off tangentially in a straight line if the continued operation of new forces did not keep it to its ever-curving orbit. So also, the curve of a nation's progress is unforeseeable, unless we know the new forces which will come into operation. The sum of the old forces only suffice to drive it forward in a straight line without curvature. None the less, it is interesting to study Mr. Peel's suggested journey along the straight line which represents the past projected into the future. He aims at high ideals moreover; he attempts, not without success, to inspire his readers with enthusiasm for sane progress. That itself is a task of greater practical utility than any mere speculation. We admire the aim, and wish well for the success of the book.

We have now traced the fundamental political change of the last century. At the close of the Napoleonic wars, the most pressing political need was the emancipation of the lower classes, and the breaking down of medieval restrictions, resulting in a political philosophy of Individualism. But that work had only gone a short way, the most vexatious inflictions only had been removed, before the movement gave way to another movement for a more even distribution of wealth. No sooner did the advance in liberty ease the incentive to individualism, than the demand for a larger share of wealth won the chief place in the political consciousness; not only was there no room left for consideration of libertarian questions, but the absorbing nature of the new ideal actually produced a type of legislation directly contrary to the type of the earlier era. So markedly is this the case that the advanced radicals of to-day refused to take part in the centenary celebrations in honour of John Bright, who represented the advanced radicalism of his own day. Yet we have seen reason to believe that the modern type of legislation is no more likely to endure than preceding types. When once the most striking inequalities have been swept away, the political mind will be seized and absorbed by other questions which will then be more urgently felt. Of what character are these other questions likely to be?

Prophecy is impossible, and only speculation can be indulged in. A period of wars may ensue, which for years will distract attention from events at home. But we prefer to believe that the new movement will take the form of a national, or perhaps, a European campaign against disease. There are various straws to show the direction of the wind. The successful extermination of hydrophobia has been a hint to the public of what can be done. Almost every year public attention is more closely directed to such subjects. The Board of Agriculture carries out extensive operations for the destruction and prevention of disease in commercial animals and plants. Among human beings, questions of health, compulsory notification of disease, &c., continually attract more attention. And in 1911 the chief measure discussed in Parliament contained a definite attempt towards the limitation of tuberculosis. Moreover, medical knowledge is ripening rapidly in the prevention of disease. It is already several years since it began to be publicly proclaimed that all zymotic diseases could be stamped out by administrative action within half a century: and that nearly all diseases are zymotic. When once that fact has been learnt and appreciated by the people, a term will be placed to the collectivist era. The resources of civilisation will be directed against the bacteria and other parasites which are by far the most powerful and vindictive enemies of man. Their satanic activity will be rendered harmless; their malignant cruelty, with the inconceivable misery it entails, will receive a check. It is incredible that this ambition for an anti-bacterial war should not be shared by all who have mastered the facts, and should not be strong enough to drive out every other question from the political mind. Consider how much sympathy is devoted (and rightly) to the cause of the prevention of cruelty to animals. A society exists, whose admirable work in this sphere is universally commended. Now the suffering inflicted by callous rascals upon domestic animals is altogether infinitely disproportionate to that experienced by man from pathogenic micro-organisms. We can imagine therefore what a storm of feeling would be aroused, if the possibility of its prevention were to become actually realised in the minds of the people. Such realisation must take time; but it is progressing fast; and by the time that the collectivist star is ready to set, it will have a powerful hold on the leading minds of the public.

Of course dogmatists on all sides will object. Individualists will dislike the movement on the ground that it is carried out by the State, and will perhaps involve certain temporary

restrictions of personal freedom. To them we can reply that the end is the greatest ever aimed at by humanity, and that no dogma of State-functions is worthy for a moment to be set against it. The socialist will equally dislike the movement, because it makes no attempt to redress economic inequalities, and leaves the means of production in private hands. To them we can reply that it matters little whether wealth belongs to A. or B. or C. or all three jointly, in comparison with the aversion of the frightful perils which threaten them all equally. The evidence is indecisive as to whether community of wealth would be good, supposing it to be workable; but there can be no two opinions that the extermination of disease would be an unmitigated good, and becomes every year more workable. A further advantage of this new propaganda is that it would no longer cause the nation to be divided into two opposing camps, of which one is trying to wrest property from the other. Mankind would not be fighting each other, but would be united to fight the common enemy. The virulence of party contests at home would be allayed, while foreign animosities might be softened by a combined action of civilised nations.

There are always a number of commonplace people who look upon any idea that is new to them, as visionary and impracticable. Their horizons are limited by the narrow circle of their own experience. Having habitually discovered that their own 'ideas' have turned out absurd, they assume that all 'ideas' have as little foundation; and they adopt a pig-philosophy, which looks upon the mud they wallow in as the last word of human civilisation. It would be of little use to draw the attention of such people to the changes wrought by science in the course of the last century, and to point out that the law of progress suggests that the changes in the course of next century will be still greater. Nor would it be worth while to multiply instances of the fact that in all history the actual realities have generally outrun the hopes of the wildest visionaries. We must accept the fact that in all races there is a large proportion of routine-lovers and congenital officials, who while making for national stability offer a solid phalanx of opposition to anything in the nature of progress or improvement. They will cry out that the nation is dominated by doctors. Well, we should as soon be dominated by doctors as by politicians; and much sooner than by the multitude of inspectors who have now settled like a swarm of locusts all over the country. We must be governed by somebody: let us choose the man who is capable of doing the most good.

However this speculation may be looked upon, we should

like once again to enter a *caveat* against the notion that the nation is going downhill. The routine-mongers above referred to—the dull mediocrities who look upon respectability as the highest virtue—are invariably of the opinion that, if things here and there are going in ways they dislike, it is a sure sign of the impending ruin and disintegration of the Empire. We subscribe to the healthy optimism of Sir Roland Wilson, who considers that public life is 'in a healthier state now than at 'any previous period of our history, and compares favourably 'with that of most, if not all, modern nations': remarkable words for one who differs so deeply from modern political tendencies. We now look back upon the Victorian age as a great age. The influence of the great Victorians was so deep that the following generation appear to have been partially paralysed by it, and to be characterised as a whole rather by reverence for the doctrines of their predecessors than by original movement of their own. But that reverence is speedily passing away before a new wave of progress; and perhaps the degeneration cry is largely caused by the universal signs of rupture with Victorian traditions. Recollecting the truth that what we find unpleasant need not necessarily be either wicked or degenerate, we number ourselves among those who look forward to a great future for the British people.

Art. VII.—THE SOVEREIGNTY OF THE AIR.

1. *The Aeroplane, Past, Present, and Future.* By C. Grahame White and H. Harper. London: Werner Laurie. 1911.

2. *The Conquest of the Air.* By Alphonse Berget. London: W. Heinemann. 1909.

3. *Mes trois Grandes Courses.* Par André Beaumont. Paris: Hachette. 1912.

For centuries Englishmen have been accustomed to the idea that a strong navy is a guaranty of national security and of empire. Other nations, during the last twenty-five years, have adopted our standpoint about the sea, and our belief that commercial interests are promoted and safeguarded by spending money upon ships; and so it has come about that in shipbuilding all the Great Powers now seem to see the secret of national pre-eminence. The advent of the 'Dreadnought' gave the nations, even those most backward in naval matters, the chance of making good their disadvantage, for the 'Dreadnought,' by outclassing and demoding smaller and older ships, made it possible for every country, as it were, to start even and from approximately the same platform. And so Power after Power announces the launch of new capital ships, and people after people groan under the burden of fresh armaments. We Englishmen are well accustomed to look to the sea, whence our help hath come in the past, but as yet we are not well accustomed to look up for it to the skies. We know the value of sea ships; we do not as yet realise the value of air ships. We do not see in aircraft the latest safeguard of national existence; we see in it a new sport, a new amusement, an excuse for motoring to Brooklands, or for spending a summer's day beside the Thames, as thousands of Londoners did when the 'Daily Mail' race was run last July. When we do begin to see in an aeroplane something vital to national existence we may cease to leave France serenely unenvied in her present sovereignty of the air. M. Clementel, the Vice-President of the Chamber of Deputies, spoke no idle words last year when he said*: 'We actually have, in matters of aviation, an 'unquestionable superiority which we hope to keep for a long 'while. Let us keep our lead. The sacrifices that we take

* Report on French Military Aviation, March 1911.

'upon ourselves on this account are sacrifices as useful as they 'are necessary.'

Just as we in the past understood and took hold of the immense possibilities opened up by navigation of the sea, so intelligent and daring French minds have immediately seized hold of the possibilities opened up by navigation of the air. They have realised that in possessing control of the air they will have exactly that superiority on land which we for so long have enjoyed at sea, and it is as interesting to watch just how long they are to be left in unquestioned possession of the air as it is interesting to note how long we were left in unquestioned possession of the sea.

Some sailors say that the publication of Mahan's book 'The 'Influence of Sea Power upon History' has been greatly responsible for opening the half-shut eyes of other nations to the value of command of the sea, and that in a way it has done us more harm than any book ever published. This we may take for what it is worth, but it leads us to wonder what book is to be written that will open our sleepy English eyes to the vital importance of command of the air.

Nothing is more startling in the history of human endeavour than the progress made in aviation during the last five years. In the autumn of 1906 Santos Dumont entered his flying machine for the 'Archdeacon Cup,' to win which it was necessary to fly 25 yards clear in the air. To everyone's amazement he flew 80 yards at a height of 3 feet and three weeks later he created 'a world's record of 230 yards.' A year later this record was beaten by Henry Farman with 311 yards at a height of 8 feet. The mile was first completed in January 1908, and in April of the same year Delagrange, one of the pioneers of aviation, remained in the air for just over 9 minutes.* In 1911, only three years later, many sensational feats were accomplished, such as a height record of 13,944 feet without a passenger and of 9800 feet with a passenger; a speed of 110 miles an hour without a passenger, and a speed of 83 miles an hour with two passengers; a flight in a forty-mile wind, a non-stop flight of 447 miles or 11¼ hours in the air, a stopping flight of 770 miles across country in one day, a flight with 13 passengers; to say nothing of the crossing of the Pyrenees, Apennines, and Rocky Mountains.

M. Beaumont, the winner of the 'Daily Mail' race last July, has written a delightful book on his great flights, and he tells us, as no other aviator has yet done, something about

* The Aeroplane, Past, Present, and Future, p. 38.

the sensations of flying. In the air anxiety vanishes, a deep content takes its place, an 'extra-terrestrial tranquillity'; the existence of man is forgotten, his towns, his trains, his ships suddenly become like children's toys, only the mountains and the sea retain their majesty in the intoxicating solitudes of space. M. Beaumont makes us long to sail the air with him as he describes his flight along the Riviera in the Paris-Rome race. In the dim morning light he watches the coast and the peaks of the mauve mountains as he travels over a sea so calm as to be like a mirror. He tells how the clouds redden under the rising sun, how the Maritime Alps are gilded; how he, the sailor, seeing an Italian warship below him at Porto Maurizio, skimmed down to the water to salute it; of the playful pursuit of torpedo-boat destroyers near Savona, and then of Genoa with all its ships, of Pisa, and of Leghorn. And, lastly, how his straining eyes discern in the far distance a something which grows in significance, the great dome of St. Peter's rising sun-bathed out of the Campagna mists. Seized by an indescribable emotion he flies on and on to the Eternal City, and the poet Rostand chose on that unique pilgrimage to write a sonnet to the Conqueror of Rome:

Tout fut beau: la victoire et le cri qui la nomme,
Et la Ville Eternelle, et la jeune saison
Et le Captif sacré quittant son oraison
Pour voir l'Aile franchir les collines de Rome.

La minute est sublime où le vieux Pape, comme
Pour laisser pénétrer le siècle et l'horizon,
Fait ouvrir la fenêtre, et veut de sa prison,
Bénir l'oiseau lointain qu'on lui dit être un homme!

Ô le plus pur effet du plus grand des exploits!
Elle vient de monter pour la première fois,
La bénédiction qui dut toujours descendre!

'*Pulvis es . . .*' dit l'Eglise au fragile mortel . . .
Mais il s'est envolé si haut, ce grain de cendre
Qu'il faut, pour le bénir, le chercher dans le ciel!

No wonder is it that poets, such as Rostand and d'Annunzio have been moved in contemplating this new human achievement to believe that in the very sublimity of flight the human soul may shed its weakness and its wickedness and soar to unexampled heights of plenitude and power.

No wonder that Jean Aicard has broken into epic verse:

'Désormais, l'homme monte au zénith sans vertige.
Homme, quel avenir annonce ton prodige?
Vient-il des mauvais dieux ou des heureux démons?
Blériot franchissant la mer, Chavez les monts,
N'ont-ils pas tous les deux, sous leurs ailes altières,
Rabaissés pour toujours les plus sûres frontières?
N'ont-ils pas étonné, de leur vol triomphal,
Le jeune Bonaparte et l'antique Annibal,
Dont les spectres, du haut de l'Alpe ou des falaises,
Ont salué debout leurs victoires françaises?
Les peuples, tressaillant d'un grand désir joyeux,
N'ont-ils pas, en plein ciel, cherché de tous leurs yeux
L'homme renouvelé, roi des airs qu'il explore,
Comme on attend, tourné vers l'Orient, l'aurore?'

The wonder rather is that we in England have not been moved to write poems in praise of aerial flight, have not been impressed by the amazing possibilities discovered by this new conveyance, this new instrument of investigation, which may open to us fresh fields of exact knowledge. Is it not marvellous, for example, to realise that now that the earth's surface may be photographed it is no longer necessary to have blank spaces on our maps? that the problem to the solution of which Sven Hedin has devoted his life may be solved more accurately than from the surface of the inhospitable land he has wandered over? M. Berget * presents to our minds a most interesting proposition; he says that to a dirigible of 5000 cubic metres volume, carrying fuel for 50 or 60 hours and with a speed of 50 kilometres an hour, a continuous flight of 2400 kilometres will be open. And that since 'the perfection of the special balloon fabrics' and the judicious use of the air ballonet enables the dirigible 'to remain in the air without loss of gas' it may be possible to establish aeronautical stations at convenient centres in great continents to which matériel and personnel could be easily conveyed. In Africa, for instance, he suggests that stations might be established at Dongola, Lake Albert, Lake Tschad, Timbuctoo, and Léopoldsville. Tracing round each centre a circle of 1100 kilometres radius, the whole of Central Africa might be mapped, explored, and photographed, and this without danger from natives, fevers, insects, or wild animals. South America is susceptible to the same oversight, and in this connexion it is interesting to remember that the distance between Spitzbergen and the North Pole is only 1300 kilometres.

And as the dirigible is in the future to amplify and revise our

* The Conquest of the Air, p. 271.

geographical knowledge of great continents, so the aeroplane has already affected the military study of maps.

In a lecture given by Captain Burke, of the Army Air Battalion, at the United Service Institution last November, we find him declaring that the aeroplane has

'already revolutionised our methods of studying maps, already the rivers and mountains and forests have lost considerably in importance. The very topographical features that we have been accustomed to regard as screens to manœuvre, and as shelters behind which concentrations can take place unobserved, have lost their old significance and have become mere obstacles to rapid movement of troops. The fortress offers no resistance to the aeroplane, the mountain and the forest hold no mysteries for it. We are confronted with new conditions, and it is not likely that strategy will be unaffected by these new conditions.'

Aircraft, there is every reason to think, are not only going to add to the store of human knowledge, but they are also going to alter the quality and the system of national defence and to endanger or to preserve national existence.

The sensational 'records' of daring aviators, and the possibilities of investigation and additional knowledge opened up by aerial navigation, interesting as they are, seem to weigh as nothing in the balance when we come to consider the aeroplane in its lowest common denominator, in relation to national existence and national safety—that is to say, in relation to war. Even M. Beaumont after winning his three great races is obliged to admit that 'l'utilisation militaire représentera 'l'unique domaine de l'aviation pendant quelque temps.'

And since it is in relation to war that experts tell us that the aeroplane is for the moment to figure in our lives, it is interesting to note the rôle it is expected to play in future campaigns. We are assured that the average modern machine with an experienced pilot can make a flight of 180 miles with a passenger, and can remain in the air for six hours, and that it can be counted on to do this on 80 per cent. of the days of the year. Captain Burke tells us that:

'the aeroplane is a part of the equipment of the modern army as vital to its efficiency as motor transport and wireless telegraphy. It is a weapon whose use we have not completely gauged, whose value we have not fully appraised. So utterly unaccustomed are we to reckon with it in studying war that we fail to realise its possibilities, fail to realise that success or failure in war may lie in this the latest weapon forged by man.'

He went on in his interesting lecture to show how it will be

possible, as indeed has been amply proved in the French manœuvres, for a general to despatch a staff officer to reconnoitre a position 60 miles away, and to have his report put into his hands in less than three hours. Information gained by advanced troops will no longer lose any of its value through being delayed in transmission, and staff officers capable of discerning a strategic situation as it developes will be able to circle out of bullet range over the enemy's whole front, and hunt far to the rear for his concealed reserves. If the weather is clear the movements of troops are as easily to be discerned as the movements of men on a chess board. Count Schlieffen prophesied in 1909 that just as cavalry before they could execute their mission had first of all to drive the hostile cavalry from the field, so airships will have to engage in a battle with the enemy's craft in the upper regions of the air, and Captain Burke draws a very unpleasant picture of the preliminary collision of aeroplanes on the outbreak of war. He assumes that the rifleman passenger in each aeroplane will aim at the enemy's pilot, that there is a possibility of wrecking other aeroplanes with the back draft of the propeller, and that it will be absolutely necessary to deprive the enemy of these 'weapons of information' as early as possible in the encounter, 'since victory is for the commander 'who is in possession of information and that army as good as 'beaten that fights in ignorance of the actual disposition of the 'enemy's troops.' He made an interesting point which goes to show the necessity of training many air pilots. He said :

> 'Since it is probable that both nations will put forward all their best pilots on the outbreak of war in order to attain a decisive advantage from the beginning, it is improbable that either side will be able to replace their pilots even though they are able to produce fresh aeroplanes. One antagonist, after this aerial battle, will be, we may confidently assume, in command of the air.'

And once one of the combatants has command of the air he will find himself 'in the position of the director of a war 'game who sees all the pieces of both sides laid out before 'him : to employ a speaking comparison, he will be playing 'against a dead man.'

Although the French were the first people to realise the enormous possibilities opened up by the use of the aeroplane in war, they evolved its relation to the army quite slowly, and it is doubtful even now whether their organisation has reached its permanent form. Up till the end of October 1911 they practically had no organisation at all. M. Messimy, the Minister for War, then announced that the period of experiment

was over and that of definite organisation was to take its place. He said that military pilots in the future would not only be used on Grand Army manœuvres and army corps manœuvres, but at all exercises, at all trainings, and at all times of the year. Generals are to grow familiar with this new arm by constant use. Each of the twenty army corps will have an aviation section as part of its organisation in the same way that it now has cavalry, artillery, army service corps, and M. Messimy also foreshadowed the probability of each regiment of artillery having special aviators attached to it. The new scheme of organisation will require several hundred pilots; officers and non-commissioned officers will be eligible for this post.

The completion of the organisation depends on the rapidity with which pilots are forthcoming. In France, the Birds of War are no longer, as the 'Matin' so elegantly phrased it, abandoned to the Winds of Chance, but with us it is for the present different. And there are excellent reasons for this, for there are undoubtedly great difficulties in organising an air corps even when flyers and machines are to be had in plenty. For one thing it has of necessity to be a corps of all arms, for which suitable officers must be drawn, irrespective of rank, from both the army and navy. The mechanics and assistants—the rank and file of the air corps—require a more skilled and specialised education than the ordinary engineer private ever receives. In fact the mechanic suitable to take charge of an aeroplane is the sort of man who could command a good salary outside the army.

The question of the internal organisation of any air corps offers many problems, since such different sorts of work may be demanded of pilots and observers. For example, for locating guns and directing fire, artillery officers would be needed: for the important work of reconnoitring and photographing fortresses and defence works, engineer officers; for tactical and strategic reconnaissance, staff officers trained to observe the signification of the movements of troops. How is this heterogeneous collection of arms to be welded together into a harmoniously working and efficient corps? The air corps, besides demanding of its officers that they should be efficient pilots, general observers, and map readers, must also, as we see, make demands of a highly specialised nature on individual officers.

An illustration of this is a reconnaissance made on the 28th of August 1911 by Captain Lebeau and Lieutenant Blard, the former acting as observer, the latter as pilot. Flying direct to Toul, the position they had been ordered to reconnoitre, they

circled over the fortress at an altitude of between 3000 and 4000 feet while Captain Lebeau took most valuable photographs of the defence works and their ramifications. The photographs were taken when the aeroplane was travelling at about 60 miles an hour. Not a single detail escaped the aviators in their report, and when they returned to headquarters these were compared with the actual defences of Toul and found identically to correspond. The general and his staff officers were quite astonished and immensely enthusiastic at these results. As is usual in most of the French reports, the two officers rejoiced in a happy 'atterrissage.'

It is small wonder that English military authorities are slow in formulating their scheme of organisation, and in setting forth the objects for which aeroplanes will be required in war, but we can hardly believe that the despondent attitude of the commandant of the Air Battalion, Brevet-Major Sir Alexander Bannerman, in his two articles* on Aeronautics in the 'Army 'Review,' is justified. He deprecates the enthusiasm for aircraft shown by those who have but superficially studied the subject of aeroplanes, from which enthusiasm he has doubtless suffered, and directs our attention to the difficulties of transport and maintenance of this new arm under war conditions. He sees in our insular position an inherent obstacle to the use of aeroplanes, for he can point to no English frontier fortress in which aircraft can be comfortably stabled after reconnaissance. The Italians in Tripoli seem to have offered solutions to some of the difficulties he raises. Although in his opinion the amount of money required to establish the new arm is trifling, yet he is averse to our spending it on this particular object until our policy tells us whether we can make use of it.

He assumes that in two or three years' time we may know definitely the offensive and defensive values of aeroplanes and dirigibles, and as we understand him he considers that no 'aeroplane policy' can really be formulated with regard to our insular army until these values are ascertained. There is a most noticeable want of enthusiasm in these articles, but we are encouraged to hope that everything is not looking quite so despairing in the Air Battalion as it was earlier in the year. In July the commandant expressed his fear lest it might be difficult to get a sufficient supply of military pilots in a small and voluntary army, the conscript army having so much greater a choice of material. In October we find him gloomily stating that there will be more pilots forthcoming than possibly can be used.

---

* Army Review, for July and October 1911.

As a nation we at least have the satisfaction of knowing that we have produced the second largest number of pilots in the world.

Though we quite understand, as we have said, the difficulty of formulating a scheme of organisation and of setting forth the objects for which aeroplanes will be required in war, we do not see any reason why the Government should have hesitated so long about the type of machine required for military use, unless it has been influenced by Sir Alexander Bannerman's pessimism. Since the Air Battalion has been created, and since it is shortly to have 100 officers, it must have machines for them to practise on.

The French military authorities actually formulated their demand as to the type of aeroplane they needed two years ago, and to this demand French constructors build.

The seven conditions essential for military aeroplanes in October 1911 were:

1. That the aeroplane and motor be constructed in France.
2. That each machine be able to fly 300 kilometres (187 miles) in a circle without a halt.
3. That machines should be able to carry 300 kilos of useful weight (exclusive of petrol, oil, water, etc.).
4. That it must be three-seated.
5. That it should be able to fly 60 kilometres an hour (37 miles).
6. That it should be able to descend in plough, crops, meadows, stubble, and be able to get off again at once.
7. That it should be easily transportable by road or rail, and easily and quickly put together.

There are also in the eliminatory tests trials making it obligatory to rise 500 metres in 15 minutes with full complement.

The prizes offered by Government at the Military Concours are the buying of the winning machine at 4000*l.* and the order of ten similar machines at 1600*l.* apiece. Each machine may in addition earn a premium of 20*l.* per kilometre on all speed over 60 kilometres, for the speed of 80 kilos 400*l.* is given per machine. Hence the successful competitor could not win less than 20,000*l.* and might win more.

From the competitor who has come in second six machines are ordered at 1200*l.* each, and the same premium is given on speed. From the competitor who has come in third four machines are ordered, and the same conditions as to speed obtain. One hundred and thirty-eight machines were entered for this competition by forty-one manufacturers using twenty-four different motors.

Our Government has not in the past embarked on any parallel enterprise for the encouragement of military aviation in this country, but in December last it issued specifications for a prize competition open to the world the conditions of which are admirable though severe. The prizes amounting to 11,000*l.* are insignificant especially in view of the fact that the winning firm has no promise held out to it of further orders, although the Government reserves to itself the right of purchasing any prize machine for 1000*l.* No one firm, however successful, is to be allowed to take more than 5000*l.* of the 11,000*l.* offered in prizes, whereas in France the winning machine earned 31,000*l.* for its makers. The conditions of the competition, and rightly so, are far harder than those of the recent French competition. Any machine which emerges successfully from the British Government tests will be a great advance upon any existing aeroplane and will embody improvements which can only be the fruit of many experiments. Such experiments cost money, a great deal of money, and it seems as though the prizes offered would not admit of any but rich and well-established firms competing.

Hitherto it has been through the munificence of private persons that national interest in aeronautics has been stimulated, in particular by Lord Northcliffe. In 1909 he offered 2000*l.* to any airman crossing the Channel; in 1910, 10,000*l.* to any airman flying from London to Manchester; in 1911, 10,000*l.* to any airman flying the Anglo-Scottish circuit. Thus Lord Northcliffe, a private individual, has already expended in prizes a sum double that which our Government is prepared to devote to the encouragement of aviation in England. But since an official prize competition has at last been inaugurated, it is not without interest to note what hitherto has been the official attitude towards the aeroplane. There is not very much to go upon, but at any rate there are the speeches of the members of the Government in charge of the War Office as well as the two articles, already alluded to, by the commandant of the Air Battalion.

In February 1911 Lord Haldane, in his Memorandum on Army Estimates,* stated 'that great efforts had been made 'to enable the army to participate actively in the present 'developement of aeronautics,' and that five aeroplanes were available for army work, of the Wright, Farman, Paulhan, Blériot, and Havilland types respectively.

He also expressed a hope that a new army dirigible, the

* Times, February 25, 1911.

Delta, would be launched at the end of April and that two large airships of foreign manufacture would be ready for use in the summer. The summer of 1911 came and went, and where did the airships sail to? Who dared fly the prehistoric Wright aeroplane? or drive obsolete Blériot XII.? Where were the army pilots who could fly the Havilland? The number of times the Paulhan went out might have been counted on the fingers of one hand. The 'large airships of 'foreign manufacture,' alias the 'Morning Post' and 'Daily 'Mail' ships, we believe to be still waiting repairs at Farnborough. The 'Delta' has not yet made her appearance. The old-fashioned Farman biplane alone was left to the army officer in which to 'participate actively in the present developement 'of aeronautics.'

In the House of Commons on the 27th of October Colonel Seely, in answer to a question from Mr. La Touche, announced that sixteen aeroplanes had been bought or acquired for the Government, and two days later, in answer to Mr. Sandys, who suggested that as the Air Battalion were only in possession of ten aeroplanes the Government had still six to buy, he stated that we had 'about sixteen aeroplanes,' and a few words further on 'that we really had nineteen aeroplanes, but one of these 'was broken beyond repair and another was out of date.' Also that the Government was the fortunate possessor of eleven types of machines, as 'an effort had been made to try all 'types.'

Hope rises eternal in the human breast and we felt uplifted in hearing that we had 'about sixteen aeroplanes,' since the presumption was that they were all machines that could be used in the field. But what did we find on investigating this matter? Why, that six out of the sixteen were out-of-date machines suitable for training purposes only, that of the two Valkyries given by Mr. Barber one had no engine and the other was still in pieces after the accident which occurred on its only flight, an accident in which one of our most gallant aviators, Lieutenant Cammell, was killed; and that one, the Paulhan biplane, had seldom been flown. This made a total of nine machines. In addition to these there were four fast modern machines fit to take the field, three of which had at that date never been flown by any army pilot. Nine and four are thirteen and we found only scattered traces of those other dismembered and antique machines, which bring the total up to 'about 'sixteen' or 'really nineteen.'

To man this strange and motley fleet we had seven army pilots, no observers and no personnel. Colonel Seely's answer,

though not untruthful, is misleading, and we cannot insist too strongly that the army is not the place for trying 'all types of machines.' The army is no place for experiments: they should be conducted outside its precincts by the aeroplane manufacturers, as in France. Anything else is waste of public money. The French army does not construct its own aeroplanes, it relies entirely on civilian firms for its supply. Officers work in with civilian firms, and are accredited by Government to the works of every successful type at Mourmelon. Colonel Seely has given us reason to hope that something of the kind is contemplated by the War Office in the immediate future. We must remember that during the critical days of last August there was no single machine fit to take the field, and that if we had been so unfortunate as to have to go to war last November there would have been but seven military pilots to drive a job lot of machines with the more modern of which they had no experience of cross-country flying. Trained observers, skilled mechanics, and organisation would have been remarkable by their absence. What a situation for a Great Power to find itself in on the outbreak of war!

It is obvious that good-naturedly to assure us of the mere existence of aeroplanes in England is foolish in the extreme, if it is nothing worse, as it shows no grasp of the essential features of the problem of military aviation. What ordinary Englishmen want to be sure about is that there is a well equipped group or corps of aeroplanes ready to take the field to-morrow, complete in every detail—that is to say, with pilot, observer, mechanic, and three men, motor lorry, transportable shed and spare parts. Now judged by this standard we had last autumn no aeroplane fit for immediate service and this in spite of the fact that in the past year we spent 150,000*l.* on this service and killed two military aviators.

Members of Parliament should make it their business to know not only whether aeroplanes exist but whether they are properly organised for war. Optimistic generalities such as those given by the Under Secretary for War on the 27th and 29th of October only throw dust into the eyes of the general public.

Public opinion must be trained to interest itself in this presently most vital question—really interested, not stimulated in a spasmodic way, as it was over the dirigibles. It is probable that not one in all the hundreds of persons incited by the 'Daily Mail' and 'Morning Post' to clamour for airships in 1910 could tell us what those airships have done or even where they are.

They both arrived in this country in October 1910. The 'Lebaudy' ship is in pieces awaiting repairs to her envelope and cradle that were necessitated by an accident that occurred during her only outing in this country on the 4th of May 1911. She has never been put up for the War Office tests as originally arranged, or been put in commission as a training ship for observers. At any rate, if she had been tested and had failed to pass the tests she might have been returned to France and been replaced by a more efficient machine, since she was only sent over 'on approval.'

The hangar at Wormwood Scrubbs is empty owing to the fact that the Clément Bayard is lying in pieces at Farnborough, waiting for renewal of the defective envelope which was purchased with the machine.

At present we have but two army airships, the Beta and the Gamma, in use, and one, the Delta, announced by Lord Haldane to appear in April 1911, is still building.

The experience of continental armies goes to show that the dirigible is neither useless nor obsolete and therefore does not merit the contempt and neglect to which we have treated it. The usual opinion seems to be that dirigibles will be used for night work and aeroplanes for day work. By night the aeroplanes can do nothing without extraordinary risks, whereas the dirigible can move about with comparative safety. As moving troops by night will be increasingly practised the dirigible will become increasingly useful. And in this connexion it is dreadful to humane persons to note how every improvement in aircraft makes the lot of the infantry soldier rather more miserable than ever, as the following incident which occurred at the French manœuvres goes to prove. A body of troops, after a long march, had just reached their camping ground and entrenched themselves for the night. About sunset an aeroplane passed over them flying high. The troops were in consequence turned out and made to march after dark to another position eight miles away, amid the bitter complaints of the rank and file.

Though the fate of the French private soldier under the tyranny of the aeroplane is tiring to contemplate, we have things to consider which are of greater national importance to us as English folk than the way in which aircraft affect the *moral* of foreign troops. First of all ought we not, since we have lost so much time already, to acquire a small nucleus of aeroplanes from foreign sources for our Air Corps, so that at least we have something to use immediately in the field should occasion demand it? Something in which to train

our officers for active service, for in order to attain any degree of comparative safety in war time, when their nerves will be additionally strained, they must fly machines to which they have become accustomed in peace time. This in our opinion is the necessary first step towards efficiency, and it is a step that should be taken at once without waiting for the results of the Government Prize Competition, for as Colonel Capper says, 'no haphazard aggregation of individual machines and 'pilots, on the outbreak of war, can be relied on, but the 'best military machines must be provided and kept up in peace, 'and numbers of officers and men be thoroughly trained in their 'uses by constant practice, both as individuals and as units 'of regular flying squadrons.' *

Let us consider for a moment the most simple and obvious ways in which we could become possessors of a well equipped even though small aero fleet. The four leading French firms have schools, and it might be a good plan for a British officer and mechanic to be sent to each of these firms for two months in order that they may thoroughly learn to understand the particular type of military machine made by the firm, and then four machines should be purchased of each type; four preferably, as they would make a handier group. Each of these groups should be accompanied by the mechanic trained in France. The officer should be responsible for training the personnel allotted from the Royal Engineers to the aeroplanes in his group. We agree with the commandant of the Air Battalion in thinking that there should be as few varieties of machines as possible, and that parts should be standardised within homogeneous groups. The important thing is that each aeroplane group (whether it consist of two or four machines) should be kept separate, so that parts and pilots would be immediately interchangeable and one of the group would always be ready for active service. All our peace preparation must obviously take the form of organisation for war.

We lay great stress on the fact that the machines of each group should be of the same type. Stability in aeroplanes depends almost entirely on the action of the pilot, and the methods of control vary in different aeroplanes. In gusty weather the balancing must be instinctive on a known machine. Pilots say that it takes six weeks to get to understand a machine of a different type, therefore it is very dangerous to expect a man to fly a type other than his own, and even machines of the same type vary. A pilot highly skilled in one type of

* The Aeroplane, Past, Present and Future, p. 196.

machine may be quite incapable of driving another type except on an absolutely calm day. It is of the highest importance that officers should be familiar with the machines they will have to fly on active service, and also that they should have a basis of common understanding and mutual confidence with the observer they carry, an understanding that can only be arrived at by many flights together in peace time.

The necessary second step towards efficiency, in our opinion, is the Government Prize Competition, which in spite of our Free Trade convictions we should like to see restricted to British-built aeroplanes. It is of course immensely important that in the future the bulk of the Air Fleet should be built in this country. We know that Italy found herself obliged soon after the outbreak of the war in Tripoli to telegraph to Paris for an additional supply of aeroplanes, being quite unable to place her order with Italian firms.

If other European countries had also been at war, the French could not have undertaken to execute the Italian order. In any case if the French themselves were at war it would be useless to expect them to supply spare parts to other nations, and it is certain that in such an eventuality no single Gnome engine would be allowed to leave the country. The average life of the Gnome engine is only 100 hours in the air. After that period many of the important parts have to be replaced.

It is obvious that there is danger (though not more to us than to others) in buying a great many aeroplanes of a type that may suddenly become obsolete, for everyone must recognise that aviation is at present at the mercy of invention. To give but one example of something that would revolutionise construction—the discovery of an automatic means of maintaining equilibrium.

The necessary third step towards efficiency would be, in our opinion, to remove the head-quarters of the aeroplane section away from Farnborough. Laffan's Plain is surrounded by trees which, as all aviators know, cause dangerous 'remous.' Cross-country flying is discouraged by this belt of trees which is encountered in half-a-mile in any direction, for no aviator can tell in a minute or two whether his engine is really working properly. The whole country is extremely difficult to fly over, and in addition the landing there is bad, as the surface is composed of long rough grass, and small bushes dangerous to the inexperienced aviator.

The Government has at its disposal admirable ground for training aviators on Salisbury Plain, where the Bristol School has trained large numbers of aviators without any accident

at all. The surface of Salisbury Plain is undulating, but it offers any amount of good landing places. It is, of course, not so perfect as the French aviation grounds, which are flat and of great extent, but it is safe and the place *par excellence* in which to establish an Air Battalion.

When a number of aviators have been trained and the Air Corps thoroughly organised aeroplane sections might be sent to various commands so that all generals may have the opportunity of learning how to use them with troops.

Aviation opens up many questions, among which the scientific study of the air seems very important. Who is going to undertake it? For undertaken it must be. We know nothing of the vortices under clouds, the reason of air pockets or cross-currents. The Admiralty employ a fleet of ships in making charts of the seas; is the Meteorological Office or the War Office to see to the charting of the air?

The whole question of aeronautics is being seriously considered by the War Office, as we gather from the admirable conditions laid down in the Government Prize Competition; but time is passing: rumours of war are sounding in our ears and as a nation we must be ready to meet any crisis that may arise. Most emphatically we must not waste the first half of 1912 as we have wasted the whole of 1911. We must not wait until the competition is over to give our airmen the most modern machines to practise on, for above the strife of parties and the din of competition sounds the clear call of Patriotism. It is sounded by the military aviators who, for the sake of their country and for no earthly gain, are willing to risk their necks in prosperous times of peace. No machines, after all, can be too good, as no honour can be too great for the army pilot. Every nation must be proud of the men who are ready to live their lives on terms of active service. Things have been made needlessly difficult for military aviators in England. Has not the time come to give them every facility to place their dangerous art at the service of their country?

In conclusion we must confess to being haunted by the thought that the sovereignty of the air may one day make sovereignty of the sea a thing in itself of no account; that command of the air may come to connote command of the sea. Given automatic stability, increased airworthiness and accuracy in attack through explosives dropped from above, given in short steady progress on what are the natural lines of developement for aircraft, and may not the aeroplanes and dirigibles of a power which commands the air master the battleships

of an island state which has trusted for security too exclusively to sovereignty of the sea? A century ago the lord of the land challenged the mistress of the seas: his many legions availed him nothing because the conditions of his age necessitated that the challenge to England should be fought out on a field which she, not he, controlled. Napoleon failed because he could not pit command of one element against command of another.

Who knows but that it may be open to the conqueror of the future to combine two elements against one and to find in an aerial fleet a potent auxiliary to his big battalions in wresting from us our present command of the sea? The very fact of human flight makes us feel as though anything and everything were possible, for nothing when we come to reflect upon it is more remarkable in the whole history of man's achievement than the conquest of air, and when we are told that certain things are impossible we feel impatiently inclined to exclaim with Mirabeau 'Impossible: let me never hear that stupid word again'!

Art. VIII.—WILLIAM PITT.

1. *William Pitt and National Revival.* By J. Holland Rose, Litt.D. London: G. Bell. 1911.
2. *William Pitt and the Great War.* By J. Holland Rose, Litt.D. London: G. Bell. 1911.
3. *British Statesmen of the Great War, 1793–1814: Ford Lectures for 1911.* By the Hon. J. W. Fortescue. Oxford. 1911.
4. *Mémoires du Comte de Bray: La Révolution Française et la Politique des Puissances Européennes.* Publiées par le Colonel d'Etat-Major Fd. de Bray: Introduction d'Ernest Daudet. Paris: Plon-Nourrit. 1911.

When, in the course of last spring, Mr. Fortescue delivered his Ford Lectures at Oxford, he had to say that an adequate history of that fateful period, 1789–1815, had not been written in English, nor yet a becoming Life of the great statesman, 'the pilot who weathered the storm,' who steered England through that trouble-tossed time. Alison's 'History of Modern 'Europe' has an overpowering bias, and does not meet modern requirements; Pretyman Tomline's Life of his illustrious pupil was written with the apparent object of showing the posterity that has abolished senior wranglers, how stupid a senior wrangler could be; and Lord Stanhope's, Lord Brougham—not always remarkable for the moderation of his language—denounced as 'trumpery, one-sided, and altogether insignificant.' Nothing that Lord Stanhope wrote merits such condemnation, but the 'Life of Pitt' is, perhaps, the weakest of his many works. Such as it was, however, it was the only one which attempted any detail; and the short sketches by Macaulay, Lord Rosebery, Mr. Whibley, excellent as they are, do not fill the void in our catalogue of biographical literature.

This defect in our histories has been in part amended, the gap in our biographies entirely filled in by the work of Dr. Rose named above, the second volume of which, including the political side of the story of the great war down to the year 1805, has been published since the Ford Lectures were given, and is a valuable commentary not only on them but on Mr. Fortescue's 'History of the British Army' (vol. iv.) as also on Captain Mahan's 'Influence of Sea Power on the French Revolution' and 'Life of Nelson,' whose career has this curious

analogy to Pitt's—that he was born and died only a few months before Pitt, and that their respective biographers speak of them, each in turn, as the antidote to Napoleon. As a 'Life of 'Pitt' considered as a civil and finance minister, lifting the country out of the slough of debt and despondency, the result of an unsuccessful war, the first volume is equally valuable. It is not too much to say that the two together must take place as the standard 'Life of William Pitt.' The author modestly rests his claims to a superiority over his predecessors on the superior advantages which he has enjoyed—access to the Pitt MSS. now in the Record Office, access to the Home and Foreign Office Records, now open to the public; to the publication of the 'Dropmore Papers' (the papers of Lord Grenville) by the Historical MSS. Commission, and to the permission which he has had to consult several private collections of Pitt's letters. This alone would tend to give his work an exceptional value; but it has another claim to superiority: that of being written in a pleasant readable style by an author who has been willing and able to make use of the opportunities which fell in his way.

By a happy coincidence, the same year that has brought us Dr. Rose's two volumes and Mr. Fortescue's Lectures, has also brought the first volume of the 'Mémoires du Comte 'de Bray'; original letters of the same period, written from a somewhat novel point of view, as being non-official, and largely to the Grand Master of Malta, of which order M. de Bray was a knight. In 1789, when the Revolution broke out, he was in his twenty-fourth year, and an attaché of the French Embassy at Ratisbon. His letters show him keenly alive to many of the evils which were troubling France; entirely in favour of the meeting of the States-General, and the suppression of the exemptions of the nobles. How far he would have been prepared to go may be doubted; he certainly did not acquiesce in the violent measures of spoliation adopted by the Jacobins; but he did not return to France, and after the deposition of the king (August 10, 1792) entered the diplomatic service of Bavaria, which State he afterwards represented successively at all the principal Courts of Europe. His letters to friends and to the Grand Master are thus entirely political—or perhaps we should rather say that all purely private matters have been omitted—and give the opinion of a trained diplomate on the news of the day, occasionally relating that news—as, for instance, the story of the king's condemnation and death—though of course at second hand, to the Grand Master.

It is beyond our purpose to enter into the often told

story of Pitt's boyhood, though we cannot pass without notice the agreement of Dr. Rose and Mr. Fortescue on the influence of heredity in the young Premier's character. A Pitt on the father's side, a Grenville on the mother's, the two writers are in accord in the opinion that though perhaps his power of speaking was derived from his father, rather by early education and practice than by descent, the main features of his character —as of his face—were from his mother; he is a Grenville with the Pitt stamp, rather than a Pitt stamped by Grenville. It is a consideration which seems to explain—possibly does explain—many of the anomalies in his way of looking at political problems, which is so puzzling when we are content to consider him merely as the son of his father: his horror, for instance, of war, from political not humanitarian reasons; his marked preference of home to foreign politics; his study of economics and of finance; his attention to detail—in all which the divergence from the father is very marked.

Dr. Rose devotes several pages of an admirable Introduction to a résumé of the state of England at the time of Pitt's accepting the office of Prime Minister (December 19, 1783), he being then in his twenty-sixth year. The social sketches may be omitted; but the facts which mainly influenced Pitt's career were the corruption of the public service, the disorder of the finances, the industrial revolution, and the need for the reform of the House of Commons. The first of these had to amend itself by slow degrees, as credit was restored, and that was largely done by the industrial revolution. Dr. Rose gives a curious table of analogies between this and the changes in the world of thought, brought about apparently by the Revolt of the American Colonies. It partly amounts to this:

1762	Publication of the 'Contrat Social.'
1764	Production of the spinning jenny.
1776	American Declaration of Independence.
	Publication of 'Wealth of Nations.'
1785	Diamond Necklace Scandal.
	Watt's double-acting steam engine patented.
	Cartwright's power-loom patented.
1789	Taking of the Bastille.
	First steam factory in Manchester.

The coincidences are curious, if they are coincidences: they are more probably the results of a general awakening of the human mind after a long period of torpor. But however that may be, it may be considered certain that it was by the Industrial Revolution that Pitt was enabled to achieve the wonderful financial successes with which he is commonly

accredited. It has happened not unfrequently that a great and startling success made by one person is due to a change, large or small, in other fields, made independently by some one else, but of which he has been able to take advantage; and the extraordinary developement of trade, the inflow of wealth consequent on the mechanical inventions of the time, gave a clever and prudent minister an unprecedented opportunity for reaping where he had not sown. Dr. Rose gives some singularly instructive and suggestive figures. The value of cotton goods exported by Great Britain was—

in 1710	£5,698	in 1790	£1,662,369
1764	200,354	1800	3,572,217
1780	355,060	1806	9,753,824

In figures such as these lies the true explanation, not only of Pitt's rapid restoration of order in the finances of the country, but also of the possibility of his financial policy during the war. For it was not only in the cotton trade that there was this extraordinary developement. The discovery that iron ore could be reduced, that iron could be smelted by coal instead of wood began to produce its effect; and that effect, added to Watt's improvements in the steam engine, seemed to open the way to a modern and real Eldorado. With this came also a desire for Parliamentary Reform. As long as agriculture was, by an overwhelming proportion, the principal industry, as long as land was the principal employment of capital, it seemed quite natural that landowners and agriculturists should pretty well command the representation of the country, as in fact they did. According to Dr. Rose:

'If we include all landowners, whether titled or untitled, it appears that they had the power to nominate 487 members out of the 658 who formed the House of Commons. In these days when the thought and activities of the towns overbear those of the country districts, we cry out against a system that designedly placed power in the hands of nobles and squires. But we must remember that the country then far outweighed the towns in importance; that the produce of the soil was far more valuable than all the manufactures. . . . Even in the year 1791 the populace of Manchester and Birmingham blatantly exulted in a constitution which left them without any direct voice in Parliament. It was in the nature of things that Grampound, Old Sarum, Gatton, and Castle Rising should return eight members; the choice of the Tudor Sovereigns had lit upon those hamlets or villages as test-places for consulting the will of the nation, and the nation acquiesced, because, even if Manchester, Birmingham, Leeds, and Sheffield had enjoyed that privilege, they would probably have sent up country gentlemen of the same type,

and after a far greater output of money and beer. Where the will of the nation is almost entirely homogeneous, there is no injustice in selecting representatives by the haphazard methods then in use.'

There may have been some who revolted against this way of taking the voice of the nation for granted ; but the objection was entirely theoretical and the objectors were an insignificant minority. The Industrial Revolution and the developement of trade very quickly changed all that, and the manufacturing towns, rapidly doubling and quadrupling their population, and increasing their wealth and their taxpaying ability beyond the prosaic limits of the multiplication table, began to think and to say that they, their population and their wealth, ought to be represented. Hence sprang up that desire for reform, which had been talked about for a year, when on the 7th of May 1782 Pitt, then a private member, moved for 'a Committee of Inquiry which should report on the best means of 'carrying out a moderate and substantial reform.' The motion was negatived, for the feeling of the squireocracy against it was very strong. But in the spring of 1785, and this time as prime minister, he brought the subject up again. It had begun to attract public attention, and on the 12th of January 1785 he wrote to the Duke of Rutland :

'I really think that I see more than ever the chance of effecting a safe and temperate plan [of Reform], and I think its success as essential to the credit, if not to the stability, of the present administration, as it is to the good government of the country hereafter.'

When it came before the House, Burke spoke vehemently and voted against it ; Fox 'damned it with faint praise' but voted for it ; the squires and the squires' nominees, of course, opposed it, and the measure was rejected by a large majority. The comments of Dr. Rose on this are just and suggestive of the advantage of accepting reasonable reforms at the proper time, instead of postponing them till they are forced on the government.

'The blow,' he says, 'was crushing and final as regards Parliamentary Reform in that age. The storms of the French Revolution and the mightier subterranean forces of the Industrial Revolution were to work upon the old order of things before the governing classes of England were brought to see the need of renovation ; and when the change came in 1832, it was not until the nation had drawn near to the verge of civil war. In 1785 the transition would have been peaceful and progressive.'

Possibly Pitt would have reverted to the proposal after a

few years, but the French Revolution came in the way. There were men who would have gone on with it, Revolution or no Revolution; but Pitt decided, in effect, that when next door is on fire is not the time for a prudent householder to call in painters and paperhangers.

But of all Pitt's legislation or attempted legislation, measures or attempted measures at that period, none has perhaps been so widely criticised as the Commercial Treaty with France, signed at Versailles on the 26th of September 1786.

'It granted complete freedom of navigation and trading rights between the two nations for their European dominions. The subjects of either kingdom were thenceforth free to enter the lands of the other without licence or passport, and free of any capitation tax—a privilege most unusual in those days—and to enjoy perfect religious liberty.'

That clause, by itself, lifts the treaty out of the domain of barbarism—the time when anyone crossing the 'mark' into another's land was promptly knocked on the head, if he did not publicly announce his presence by blowing a loud-sounding horn. The other clauses relate to conditions of trade and to the duties to be levied on the different commodities. The treaty by no means introduced 'Free Trade,' but it was a first advance towards it. The duties on wine—the most important of French exports—were lowered to those on the wines of Portugal. This was to the advantage of France, though from a sanitary point of view—which probably no one thought of—it was also much to the advantage of England.

'Hardware, cutlery, and similar goods were not to pay more than 10 per cent., cottons, woollens, muslins, lawns, cambrics, and most kinds of gauzes, not more than 12 per cent., but silks, or articles partly silken, were prohibited as formerly.'

All this was to the direct trade-advantage of England. Pitt could see that, and said so in the House of Commons; but the people he addressed could not; and he was much blamed for allowing cotton manufactures to be admitted at all. The French, on their side, were not slow to realise it, with the exception of the wine growers of Bordeaux; for they, like Pitt, could see these clauses of the treaty did not tell in their favour. This is what Dr. Paul Mantoux has to say about it in his excellent and interesting 'La Révolution Industrielle':

'La supériorité de la production anglaise était telle, que les pays voisins n'auraient pu se défendre contre son envahissement que par une politique de stricte prohibition. En fait, ils n'adoptèrent

jamais cette politique. Avant le trouble profond jeté dans la vie économique de l'Europe et du monde par les grandes guerres de la Révolution et de l'Empire, l'opinion tendait, sinon au libre échange, tel que l'entendirent, au siècle suivant, les Cobden et les Bright, du moins aux traités de commerce, aux accords internationaux fondés sur des concessions mutuelles. Le traité franco-anglais de 1786 en est l'exemple le plus intéressant. Et l'un de ses effets fut d'ouvrir le marché français aux produits de Manchester et de Paisley. Il est vrai qu'en retour les tissus de coton fabriqués en France furent, pour la première fois, admis à pénétrer en Angleterre. Mais ce régime de réciprocité ne pouvait manquer de profiter à celui des deux pays qui, grâce au progrès technique, pouvait produire la plus grande quantité de marchandises, et aux prix les plus bas.' (P. 254.)

Naturally there were violent outcries against such concessions, by the manufacturers of cotton, and to a less extent by the rivals of Sheffield ; but the whole treaty came to an untimely end in the cataclysm of 1789.

Meantime there were other events of foreign interest which stirred the nation, one of which would probably have relegated Pitt to private life if there had been any possible successor. It is often thought strange that Pitt's government endured so many defeats, without Pitt being called on to resign. It was, in fact, that the only alternative to him was Fox, and that whatever momentary objection the House might have to Pitt, its objection to Fox was deep-rooted and permanent.

In 1789 three small English merchant ships which were carrying on a not unprofitable trade in furs with Canton and Macao were seized in Nootka Sound, on the west coast of Vancouver's Island, by some Spanish men-of-war, who claimed that the country belonged to Spain, in spite of the notorious fact that it had been discovered by Cook and been more recently examined by Vancouver. When this seizure was reported at home, the Government at once saw that the pretensions of the Spaniards could not be admitted, that the ships must be restored and compensation paid to the traders. This Spain, trusting at first in the old alliance with France and on receiving French support, refused. Thereupon a large fleet was put in commission, known in the annals of the time as the Spanish Armament of 1790, and before this threat, since no help was forthcoming from the French, who were just then otherwise engaged,* the Spaniards gave way and made the amends as desired. The affair was discussed in Parliament, but, on each

* See also Despatches of Earl Gower, p. 38 *n*.

side, in a way that might almost be called 'parochial.' No one, not Pitt himself, seemed to understand that the issue marked the retreat of the Spaniards from their world-wide pretensions or that it was a formal opening of the Pacific to English trade; now, it may be considered the foundation stone of the present maritime position of Canada in the South Sea.

The victory which he had won over Spain and over the Opposition emboldened Pitt to further interference on the Continent. This was a somewhat intricate attempt to curb the ambition and greed of the Czarina. It is difficult to describe an affair which has so many 'loose ends'; but shortly, it seemed that having checked the desire of Poland to reform its government on a constitutional basis, Catherine was now preparing to annex the whole of it—a proceeding which the King of Prussia, with his eye on Danzig and Thorn, would not allow if he could help it; having defeated Sweden, she wished that country to pay for its defeat; and having won Oczákoff from the Turks, she intended to hold it and the strip of land from it to the Dniester, as giving her the command of the Black Sea trade. All this was, in Pitt's opinion, a serious danger to the balance of power, and he wished to check her aspirations by diplomacy or, if necessary, by arms. In both he was thwarted by Fox and Fox's friends and agents, who took measures to keep Catherine well informed of the trend of English public opinion, and were able to induce Parliament to negative the proposal of armed intervention to enforce the restoration of Oczákoff.

In the north the diplomacy was not entirely unsuccessful, though Pitt could not prevent the partition of Poland a couple of years later; but in the south, the Russian Semiramis tightened her grip on Oczákoff and its adjacent territory, knowing that Pitt was powerless. His defeat was indeed more marked by the fact that, assuming he could command a majority in the House, as on the former occasion, he had ordered a number of ships to be commissioned—a step known in naval history as The Russian Armament of 1791. When his policy was disapproved of by the House of Commons, the fleet had to be paid off, and Pitt's prestige was certainly lowered in the face of all Europe. There is no doubt that the Opposition, led in this by Fox, was acting mainly from a desire to thwart and annoy Pitt, but largely also because—being as entirely ignorant of European politics as of the geography and geographical surroundings of Oczákoff—they conceived that a place of which they had never heard before could not be worth fighting for. That Odessa now covers part of the territory then ceded by

Turkey, and that Nikolaieff is on the Dnieper protected by the forts at Kerson and Oczakoff are proofs that Pitt knew more about the locality than Fox who so recklessly withstood him.

It was the first serious defeat that he had received, and its effect was lasting, more so than the loss of Oczákoff would seem able to cause. It encouraged the Opposition, it encouraged his enemies abroad, it encouraged the enemies of England, and to some extent, difficult at all times to gauge, it lessened Pitt's confidence in himself and his power. It seemed to fill him with a sense of undue caution that was foreign to his nature. Probably he would have lived all this down, and, leaving foreign affairs to themselves, would have applied himself to further financial exertions and financial successes. The hope was blasted by the outbreak of war. The exertions had still to be made; success, as he understood it, was impossible.

It was at the time assumed by the Opposition, was loudly asserted by the Jacobin sympathisers and by the half-starving mob: it was put on record by Macaulay, and is even now frequently asserted, that this was entirely Pitt's fault, if not crime; that he had all along been hostile to the Revolution and that the guillotining of the French king seemed to put the coping-stone on the pile of French wickedness and induced him to declare war on the murderers, false to the principle—as sound in politics as in trade—of minding his own business. This deduction would be quite true if the premises were not entirely false. In politics as in trade, there is little room for sentiment, and the doctrine of non-interference forbade England to take any measures of war or diplomacy, to save or to avenge the death of France's king. In point of fact she did not undertake any such measures. Proposals were made, both in and out of Parliament, to send an appeal to the Convention or to the nation at large. But, says Dr. Rose:

'Pitt pointed out that, on August 17, George III. had expressed an earnest desire for the safety of Louis and the Royal family of France in terms which were then read out. The same was the desire of every Briton; and the sentiments now expressed in that House would be heard and noted at Paris. If any more formal measure were to be adopted, he suggested the entering a protest in the Journals of the House; but any public representation, he said, must be couched in terms of indignation which must tend to defeat its own object.'

and he adds:

'Of one thing we may be certain. The readiest way of assuring the doom of the hapless monarch was to take up some one of the

silly or guileful schemes then mooted for pressing the British Government to take sides in the trial. Pitt's rigorous neutrality was the best means of helping the advocates of Louis in their uphill fight with the hostile Convention.'

Nor did England declare war for that or any other reason. The declaration came from France, it had nothing to do with the death of the king, it was virtually decided on several days before it. 'The execution of Louis XVI. was in no sense the 'cause of the War,' is the conclusion at which Dr. Rose arrives after a long discussion of the conditions which we must endeavour to summarise. And in the first place it is necessary to contradict the too common belief that Pitt was hostile to the Revolution, if not from its beginning, at least from a very early date.

With respect to his attitude towards revolutionary France, in 1792, 'it is satisfactory,' says Dr. Rose, 'to have indirect 'proofs of his desire to maintain a strict, if not friendly, neutral-'ity. This proof lies in his handling of the nation's armaments 'and finances.' It is beyond contradiction that on the 17th of February 1792 Pitt, in presenting the budget, proposed to reduce the expenditure on armed forces—navy, army, and foreign subsidies—by 190,000*l.* He reckoned that he had a surplus of 600,000*l.*, part of which was allocated to the reduction of the National Debt, part to the remission of certain taxes and to the Sinking Fund, which last, if the rate could be continued, would grow in fifteen years to 4,000,000*l.*, the interest of which would then be applied to the relief of the nation's burdens.

'I am not presumptuous enough,' he said, 'to suppose, that when I name fifteen years, I am not naming a period in which events may arise which human foresight cannot reach, and which may baffle all our conjectures. We must not count with certainty on a continuance of our present prosperity during such an interval; but unquestionably there never was a time in the history of this country when, from the situation of Europe, we might more reasonably expect fifteen years of peace than at the present moment.'

Here was assuredly no thought, no covert suggestion of war with France. It was impossible that he could approve of all the French were doing or had done, but his attitude was then, as it had been from the beginning, one of absolute neutrality. So far as he was concerned, the French had perfect freedom to manage their domestic affairs as they liked. But was this really the case? had his attitude been one of absolute neutrality from the beginning? Was he not a partner—a sleeping partner

perhaps—in the Treaty of Pillnitz, in August 1791? Was he not, as the French have loudly and persistently maintained, an accessory to the attempted invasion of French liberties and French soil, which led directly to the deposition of the king, and to the massacre of royalist prisoners, ere it was defeated at Valmy? Did he not, then and afterwards, give to the enemies of the Revolution the support of English gold?

It is curious that the fables here referred to have existed so long and obtained such currency, not only in France but also in England, where it is not uncommon, even now, to hear the beginnings of the war spoken of in an apologetic tone, as justifiable on account of the infamous conduct of the Convention, or that—'the circumstances under which the war was begun 'rendered it an evil of still less magnitude to Great Britain 'than peace itself would have been'; for they were, in fact, not only contradicted, but fundamentally disproved, by Herbert Marsh, to German readers in February 1799, and to an English public in 1800. Still earlier for Frenchmen—as many of them as were able or chose to read—in the 'Mémoires sur la 'Révolution,' by the Marquis de Bouillé, who relates how, on the 12th of September 1791—sixteen days after the agreement of Pillnitz concluded between the Emperor and the King of Prussia—the Emperor sent for him and told him that he had deferred seeing him till then, because he was awaiting answers from Russia, Spain, England, and the principal sovereigns of Italy. He had now received their answers, by which, he went on, 'Je suis assuré de la co-opération de toutes ces puissances, à 'l'exception de l'Angleterre, qui est déterminé à observer la 'plus stricte neutralité.'

Marsh's work, though of great power in his own day, and though—or, perhaps, because—it won for him a pension and eventually a bishopric, has been, since then, sadly neglected and is to-day but little known except among professed students of history; but its evidence now is vastly strengthened by Dr. Rose, who quotes from the Declaration of Pillnitz the hope of the signatories (Leopold and Frederick William) that—

> 'All the Sovereigns of Europe will not refuse to employ, in conjunction with their said Majesties, the most efficient means in proportion to their resources to place the King of France in a position to establish with the most absolute freedom, the foundations of a monarchical form of government, which shall at once be in harmony with the rights of sovereigns and promote the welfare of the French nation. In that case (*alors et dans ce cas*) their said Majesties, the Emperor and the King of Prussia, are resolved to act

promptly and in common accord with the forces necessary to attain the desired common end.

'Obviously,' continues Dr. Rose, 'the gist of the whole declaration lay in the words *alors et dans ce cas*. If they be emphasised, they destroy the force of the document; for a union of all the monarchs was an impossibility, it being well known that England would not, and Sardinia and Naples (probably also Spain) could not, take up arms. In fact, on that very evening, Leopold wrote to Kaunitz that he had not in the least committed himself. "*Alors et dans ce cas* is with me the law and the prophets. If England fails us, the case is non-existent." . . . To the good sense and insight of Grenville and Pitt, the Pillnitz Declaration was one of the "*comédies augustes*" of history, as Mallet du Pan termed it. Grenville saw that Leopold would stay his hand until England chose to act, meanwhile alleging her neutrality as an excuse for doing nothing. Thus, the resolve of Catherine to give nothing but fair words being already surmised, the *émigrés* found to their annoyance that Pitt's passivity clogged their efforts—the chief reason why they shrilly upbraided him for his insular egotism.'

And we now have the further testimony of the Comte de Bray, which has been published too late for Dr. Rose to adduce it. On the 15th of September 1791, writing to the Grand Master of Malta an account of the Declaration and of what had been done in respect thereto, he says:

'En conséquence du concert présumé des differentes cours, *alors et dans ce cas*, les soussignés se détermineraient à employer la force des armes et donneraient des ordres pour faire marcher des troupes vers les frontières.' . . . 'Monsieur de Calonne a surtout cherché à fortifier la cause des princes, que l'on pourrait appeler la cause de la France, de l'appui de l'Angleterre; mais je n'ai jamais regardé cette puissance que comme disposée à profiter de nos désastres. En effet, malgré toute la bonne volonté du roi d'Angleterre et les dispositions favorables de M. Pitt, le parti de l'opposition trouverait trop d'appui dans l'opinion publique nationale pour que la cour osât risquer de la contredire en cherchant à rétablir le roi de France. Je n'examinerai point ici si cette opinion est fondée en politique et si le ministre voit mieux que la nation; il suffit qu'elle existe pour déterminer la conduite du roi.' (P. 212.)

He goes on to say that 'the famous Burke' sent his son to the princes to say that he was entirely devoted to their cause, and advised them to send a special agent whom the Duke of Gloucester would introduce to the king. The princes were accordingly going to send Monsieur de la Bynthinaye with instructions which seemed to him (de Bray) somewhat ill-considered, 'outrées, violentes et indiscrètes.'

'On y presse, entre autres, le roi d'Angleterre de faire, comme

Electeur de Hanovre, ce qu'il ne peut exécuter comme roi d'Angleterre ; en conséquence, de faire lever dans cet électorat un corps de troupes de 12,000 hommes, de donner ordre à la régence de Hanovre de retirer et rétracter les instructions qu'elle a données à son ministre à la Diète, instructions absolument opposées au parti de rigueur qu'on désirait voir adopter par l'Empire.' (P. 213.)

He could only hope that these instructions would be cancelled, which indeed seems to have been done, as nothing more is heard of Bynthinaye or his mission. The position was indeed full of traps for the unwary. Russia was anxious to know what part England was going to take and instructed her ambassador to find out. His answer was,

'that England would persevere in the strict neutrality which she had all along observed, and that, with respect to the measures of active intervention which other Powers might have in contemplation, it was His Majesty's determination not to take any part in either supporting or in opposing them.'

Though Russia and Spain had both given their adhesion to the Declâration of Pillnitz, the resolve of these two powers and even of Austria not to move unless England joined in, 'enables us,' says Dr. Rose, 'to test the sincerity of the con-'tinental monarchs.' And, in fact, the Czarina Catherine had other and altogether different aims. 'The Empress,' said Kaunitz, 'only waits to see Austria and Prussia committed 'to France, to overturn everything in Poland.' The fact however, as regards England, stands out clearly enough: that at no time, either by word or deed, did the English government give the princes or the concerted powers the slightest reason to suppose that she would join in any attempt to coerce the French people.

Nor, whatever the *sans-culottes* may have believed, did the French ministry then think that she would. On the contrary, as Mirabeau had, in dying, 'urged the need of an Anglo-French '*entente*,' the Convention sent Talleyrand to London. He was received courteously, almost cordially, by both Pitt and Grenville. Pitt 'reminded him in a friendly way of their 'meeting at Rheims, remarked on the unofficial character of the 'ex-bishop's "mission," but expressed his willingness to discuss French affairs, about which he even showed curiosity.' Grenville afterwards spoke to the envoy in the same courteous but non-committal manner. Talleyrand was however charmed. He wrote to Delessart, the Foreign Minister at Paris: 'Your 'best ground is England; . . . Believe me the rumours 'current in France about the disposition of England towards

'us are false.' Further conversations between the envoy and the two English ministers are reported, out of which Talleyrand formed the conclusion that an *entente* was possible, but that England would be strictly neutral.

'He had already divined the important secret that the cabinet was divided on this subject, the King, Thurlow and Camden being hostile to France, while Pitt, Grenville and Dundas were friendly. When Talleyrand ventured to ascribe those sentiments to Pitt and Grenville, the latter did not deny it, and he at once echoed the desire expressed by the envoy for the conclusion of an Anglo-French alliance. That the greater part of the British people would have welcomed such a compact admits of no doubt. On the walls were chalked the words: "No war with the French."'

All which agrees very exactly with the judgement formed by the cool head of Monsieur de Bray. A few months later, Talleyrand appeared again in London, this time as the adviser of an ambassador accredited by Louis XVI., and charged with an offer to cede Tobago if, on its side, the British Government would guarantee a French loan of three or four million sterling, to be raised in London. He was also empowered to offer various other suggestions, which might not improperly be called attempts at political bribery, but it does not appear that he found an opportunity for making any of them, and it is quite certain that the loan was neither guaranteed nor raised.

As the summer advanced, so did the allied army, but with faltering steps, tentatively as it seemed and more anxious for words than blows. But the tongue or pen can wound and enrage more almost than the sword. On the 24th of July Prussia declared war against France. On the 27th the Duke of Brunswick—commander-in-chief of the allied army—issued 'the 'famous manifesto to the French people which thrilled the 'French people with indignation against the hapless sovereigns 'at the Tuileries whom it was designed to protect.' Dr. Rose suggests that Brunswick really objected to the manifesto, and only—'owing to the weariness or weakness of old age, yielded 'to the insistence of the *émigrés* at his headquarters.' But Brunswick, though old, was not in a second childhood; but that is of no consequence; it did not matter who wrote it, nor how it was produced; it was enough that the commander-in-chief of the allied army sanctioned its issue.

The manifesto was published in Paris on the 3rd of August, and on the 10th, after a week of unrest, the Tuileries was invaded, the Swiss guards slain, and the king deposed. On the 19th of August the allies crossed the frontier: Paris answered by the arrest of all accessible priests and all known or suspected friends

of the king, and by throwing them into prison ; and on the 2nd of September and following days by ruthlessly massacring them—a work of blood the horror of which is here but half understood ; for a vast majority of Englishmen are content with what Carlyle has told them about it, and it would appear from Carlyle's ravings that he thought it terrible indeed, but grimly and grandly heroic. It was in truth horrible beyond description.*

On the 20th was Valmy, which, childish as it seems from a military point of view, marked, none the less, the birth of the most wonderful army known in modern history. The irony of the situation is that though, in common phrase, ranked among the glories of France, and though it fully answered the needs of the French people, the repulse or rather the check to the allied arms was in no way due to the action of the French army, but to that of the Empress of Russia who, true to the forecast of Kaunitz, no sooner saw Prussia and Austria entangled in France, no sooner felt assured of the absolute neutrality of England, than she hurled the forces of Russia on the doomed Poland. Grenville in refusing the intervention of England had, in Dr. Rose's opinion, passed sentence of death on Poland.

' On this important subject he must have acted with the consent of Pitt ; but the opinion of he latter is unknown. It would seem that after the weak treatment of the Oczákoff crisis by Parliament, he gave up all hope of saving either Turkey or Poland. If that was impracticable in the spring of 1791, how much more in August 1792, when French affairs claimed far closer attention ? It is worth noticing that several of the Foxites (not Fox himself, for he was still intent on a Russian alliance) now revised their opinion about Catherine II. and inveighed against her for trampling on the liberties of Poland. Did they now discover the folly of their conduct in previously encouraging her ? '

Prussia, intent for the last twenty years on getting Danzig and Thorn—the remnants of Western Prussia—into her own hands, had no idea of tolerating the monopoly which Russia had in view ; neither could Austria wait quietly for Catherine to appropriate the great bulk of Poland, and for Frederick William to absorb the rest. She must have her share, and so the Austrian and Prussian troops, while physically looking west to meet the French, were mentally looking east

* The horror of the ' September Massacres ' is too often lost in a cloud of words, Carlylese or other. The best and simplest account of them is that sent by Monro to Grenville, as a Narrative of Passing Events, September 4. ' Despatches of Earl Gower,' pp. 225 *ff.*

to watch the doings of Catherine and the intention of each other. 'If the French war,' says Dr. Rose, 'worked disaster 'at Warsaw, the prospect of a partition of Poland undoubtedly 'helped to lessen the pressure on France during the campaign 'of Valmy.' And early in the following year (the 31st of January 1793) the Comte de Bray wrote to the Grand Master :

'L'entrée des troupes prussiennes en Pologne, confirme mes idées sur les vues que l'on a sur ce pays et sur l'importance des préoccupations qu'elle éveille chez les alliés et qui rendent impossible une action sérieusement conduite de leurs armées contre les troupes républicaines. Je me confirme de plus en plus que ce sont les affaires de Pologne qui auront sauvé la République française, si elle parvient à surmonter les dangers qui l'entourent.'

It is thus perfectly certain that Pitt and Grenville and England had no concern either with the declaration of Pillnitz or with the advance to Valmy, or with any of the other anti-Revolutionary actions or proposals of the continental powers in the summer of 1792.

When on the 10th of August the King was deposed and the monarchy put an end to by the party into whose hands the liberties of France had been delivered, the credentials of Lord Gower—the English ambassador in Paris—which were, of course, addressed to the King and the King's ministers, automatically lapsed ; and as it appeared neither safe nor dignified for him to remain in Paris as a private individual, he was very properly recalled. This step was undoubtedly displeasing to what Dr. Rose calls 'the French Government' ; and Gower had some difficulty in obtaining his passports ; but it was impossible to allow him to stay without credentials ; and there was neither person nor court to whom he could have been accredited, even if Pitt had been prepared to acknowledge any such—as to which we have no clear information. 'The opinions of George III. 'and Pitt on the events of that bloody harvest-time in Paris 'are,' says Dr. Rose, 'very little known.' No letters from either throw any light on it. But Burke—

'writing to Grenville on September 19,' says 'that the crisis exceeds in gravity any that is recorded in history ; and he adds these curious words : "I know it is the opinion of His Majesty's Ministers that the new [French] principles may be encouraged, and even triumph over every interior and exterior resistance, and may even overturn other States as they have that of France, without any sort of danger of their extending in their consequences to this Kingdom." Can we have a clearer testimony to the calm but rigid resolve with which Pitt and his colleague clung to neutrality ? '

We may take for granted that, as a man, Pitt felt at least as much horror and disgust at the 'September massacres' as any of his more excitable countrymen; but, as a minister in charge of the helm of state, he could not but feel that as long as the French confined their butchery to Frenchmen, it was no business of the men of other nations. But as Dr. Rose truly remarks—'Reticence is a virtue over-developed in an 'aristocracy': slow in taking root among democracies, and

'the early Radical clubs of Great Britain regarded it as their cherished privilege to state their opinion on foreign affairs with Athenian loquacity; and the months of October and November 1792, when we vainly seek to know the inner feelings of Pitt, are enlivened by resolutions expressing joy at the downfall of tyrants, and fervent beliefs in the advent of a fraternal millennium.'

This sort of thing was considered as mainly due to a bad harvest, and dire want through the country, which Pitt hoped to relieve in some degree by a reduction of taxation, the intention of which he had advertised. At the close of October the French agent Noël reported to his minister, that 'Pitt was 'not arming, and was still inclined to hold aloof from French 'affairs.' In fact, so late as the 6th of November, Grenville wrote to Auckland that, on all grounds, non-intervention in continental affairs is the best policy for Great Britain. In fact, however, the emissaries of the Jacobins and the French ambassador—the ex-marquis Chauvelin, who had been allowed to remain in London though his powers had lapsed by the deposition of his king—contrived to give a good deal of uneasiness by their intercourse with these Radical societies; which became more active after the French victory at Jemappes. By itself, perhaps, this would not have been thought much of, but the overrunning of Belgium seemed to be intended merely as a prelude to reducing Holland likewise.

The Convention too was delirious with pride at having won Belgium so easily, and in rapid succession poured forth propagandist decrees regardless of treaty or of international law. The Austrians were to be pursued without respect to their place of refuge—Germany or Holland. The estuary of the Scheldt, within Dutch territory, and controlled by the Dutch by and since the treaty of Munster in 1648—a control which had been repeatedly recognised by the French and as late as 1787—was declared open to general navigation.

'By the Anglo-Dutch alliance of the year 1788, we had 'covenanted to uphold the rights of the Dutch in this and other 'respects. Thus the French Republic was taking upon itself

to rescind a well-established right of the Dutch Republic.' On the 19th of November the French declared their resolve 'to grant fraternity and assistance to all people who wish to 'recover their liberty,' and on the 27th they formally incorporated Savoy in the French Republic, thus giving a very practical lie to their former declaration that 'France would 'make no conquests.' Finally on the 15th of December they asserted their

'resolve to revolutionise all countries where its armies are or shall come. It will recognise no institutions alien to the principles of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity . . . and that France will treat as an enemy the people which refuses to accept Liberty and Equality, and tolerates its prince and privileged castes.'

All this was deeply significant. The closing of the Scheldt was guaranteed by England primarily—mainly, perhaps—in the interests of her allies the Dutch, but largely also in her own. Antwerp as a commercial port might be nearly as formidable to London as to Rotterdam or Amsterdam, and in the hands of the French might be more formidable still as a naval port. The Convention refused to be bound by a treaty made by the effete monarchy, and urged the Law of Nature as opposed to the Law of Nations. Antwerp, they asserted, had a natural right to access to the sea, and on them it rested to see that she got it. Dr. Rose is inclined to agree with them as to the Law of Nature which forbade the barring of a navigable river to the commerce of aliens and so almost strangling the trade of Antwerp. He seems to forget that the Law of Nature is and always has been

'That they should take who have the power,
And they should keep who can.'

It is the Law of Nations which—in the absence of special agreement—presumes freedom of navigation; but in this case, there was special agreement, to which the French were parties, and which they had confirmed only four years before. It could not be tolerated that they were to say off-hand that, having had a revolution, they now took a different view of things and were going to act as they thought fit, in defiance of any pledges to the contrary. When to this was added the annexation of Savoy as a clear indication of an intention to annex the Austrian Netherlands and to seize on Holland, on no other pretext than that it was rich and feeble, the position became very difficult.

From the earliest times, it had been a maxim of England's policy that the Low Countries must be practically independent. For this—mixed of course with other reasons—she had warred

with France in the time of John, of Edward III., of William III. and of Anne, and with Spain in the time of Elizabeth, who was equally resolved against the supremacy of France, even at the risk of a massacre of St. Bartholomew; and certainly Great Britain was not now going to accept, at the bidding of a Jacobin mob, what had been refused to Philip II. or Louis XIV.

The desire for peace was very strong in the heart of Pitt, but yielding was as impossible as compromise. On the 13th of November our Ministers assured the Dutch Government that they would oppose a French invasion of Holland, and this message they authorised Lord Auckland, the British Minister at the Hague, to have published as a warning to France. It seems to have been published at the Hague on the 16th, the very day that at Paris the Convention published the decree for the opening of the Scheldt. 'Both Powers publicly com-'mitted themselves on the same day to opposite courses of 'action from which pride or conviction forbade them to recede.' Neither had the least intention of receding. The British Ministry were kept to their declaration by their pledges to Holland and by their own commercial interest; the Convention was kept to theirs, by the knowledge that any apparent wavering in face of what might be considered a foreign threat would endanger their own lives.

As between the two Governments the questions at issue were simply these: the French were determined to have their own way; the British were determined to prevent them. So entirely was this the case that when on the 3rd of December the French Convention decreed the trial of Louis XVI. 'for 'high treason against the nation,' and though the news caused general indignation,

> 'it is noteworthy that Pitt and Grenville rarely, if ever, referred to this event; and that, before it was known, they had declared the impossibility of avoiding a rupture with the French Government if it persisted in adhering to the November decrees.'

Similarly, all through December, writing, indeed, without confidential knowledge of the English policy, but with a practised judgement of the public phases of the dispute, the Comte de Bray repeatedly expresses his opinion that war cannot be avoided; and from the Hague, on the 26th of January 1793, the day after the news of the King's death had been received, he refers to Grenville's note of the 31st of December—'noble, ferme et sagement détaillée'—and to his later conversations with Chauvelin, which, as travestied by the ex-marquis to Lebrun, the French Minister of War, and by

Lebrun to the Assembly, were, in Dr. Rose's opinion, one of the more direct causes of the war. At that date, de Bray thought war between England and France inevitable, though the French ministers would wait, if possible, till their fleet, at present dispersed all over the Mediterranean, had got home; but nevertheless:

'La France s'est embarquée trop avant pour reculer. C'est impossible, parce que 1° ce pouvoir n'est pas un; 2° parce qu'une fois lancée dans la carrière de sottises et d'horreurs, où les Jacobins se promènent depuis longtemps, il ne leur est plus permis de s'en tirer. L'opinion de leurs peuples les y retiendra jusqu'à ce qu'ils y périssent; des tempéraments sont inadmissibles pour les gens qui les ont tous violés. Si le pouvoir exécutif voulait évacuer la Belgique, renfermer l'Escaut, restituer la Savoie, rendre Mayence, &c., il ne pourrait pas. Or, implicitement, la note de Mylord Grenville exige tout cela, et l'Angleterre ne peut plus transiger sur ces points importants, pas plus que l'Europe entière.' (P. 345.)

Two days later—on the 28th of January—he wrote again:—

'L'ouverture de l'Escaut, le décret du 19 Novembre, et la conduite des brigands que les Français ont tenus à Mayence et dans les Pays-Bas ont retourné les esprits; le massacre du roi achèvera de les guérir. Mais il est certain qu'à Utrecht, on a été pendant huit jours dans de grandes alarmes fondées. Plus j'examine, plus je réfléchis, et plus une guerre entre la Hollande et l'Angleterre, et la France, me paraît inévitable.' (P. 346.)

No doubt 'le massacre du roi' loomed very big in the eyes of the Comte de Bray, probably also in those of King George, certainly in those of the great body of the British people; but to Pitt and his immediate colleagues it was but an incident which, however dreadful, did not affect British interests. The opening of the Scheldt, the invasion of Holland, the virtual annexation of Belgium did; and it can scarcely be doubted that the continued refusal of their demands, and the insolent behaviour of Chauvelin would have forced the hand of the British Government, if it had not been anticipated by the French Ministry—who on the 1st of February recalled their agent, and declared war—the immediate causes of which were, in Dr. Rose's opinion, not only Chauvelin's reports 'on the readiness 'of Britons to revolt,' but also the boundless self-confidence with which their victory at Jemappes had inspired the French.

The declaration of war, issued in Paris on the 1st of February, seems not to have been known in England till the 8th. Really the certainty of war, however declared, had been foreseen for some weeks, and thus from the latter end of January we must date the beginning of Pitt's career as a War Minister, in which—it is

matter of common assertion, made too with all the weight of Macaulay's authority—he cut but a poor figure. This has been repeated from that time to the year just closed, in which Mr. Fortescue has stated roundly that his conduct of the war was as bad as it could be.

On the story of the war itself, as far as it comes within his field of view, Mr. Fortescue will be everywhere accepted as a safe guide; but he is perhaps not to be so implicitly relied on in his references to the policy which was behind the active measures he describes; and in his judgements of men, he appears at times to form his opinion on insufficient or unsatisfactory evidence. Of course, in judging Pitt's share of the strategy and conduct of the war it is necessary to consider Pitt's conception of the war, and how far he was a free agent; how far his work was thwarted by the House of Commons, or stultified by the intervention of the King. A politician does not necessarily take the same view of a war as a soldier, and his ideas may not unfrequently be found to hamper, or even to hinder the soldier's work.

In this case, undoubtedly, Pitt's idea was that the main, if not the sole, objects of the war were the defence of Holland, the closing of the Scheldt, the independence of Belgium; and his hope was—if we can interpret his mind—to confine it to the localities directly interested. Pitt was not the inventor of this idea of localising a war, and since his time it has been frequently revived, though it is not always acceptable to the men who have to give effect to it. But Pitt's great fault in the eyes of Mr. Fortescue was, that having determined that Belgium was so pointed out as the seat of the war, he did not forthwith throw into the country an army of at least 60,000 men. The obvious reply to such a criticism is, that he had not got them to throw; and when he separates his judgement into its component parts, Mr. Fortescue sees this clearly enough. Yes, he says, in effect, but he ought to have had them. In this is clearly shown the great difference possible between the opinions of men, according to their point of view. Lord Rosebery, writing as a politician, speaks of the English army as, relatively to those on the Continent, 'respectable and 'powerful'—an extraordinary dictum, even from a politician; as a comment on which Mr. Fortescue says, 'only with the greatest 'difficulty could 5000 men be scraped together in two months for 'this service, and even a third of these were raw and useless 'recruits.'

It was not only in Belgium that, according to Mr. Fortescue, Pitt ought to have 60,000 or 100,000 men. At Toulon, in La

Vendée, wherever war could be waged, large numbers of men should have been sent. From the purely military point of view, Mr. Fortescue is undoubtedly right; there was little use, or rather it was courting disaster, to send men in driblets to meet the French armies, and the policy which sent these driblets may well be questioned. Had Pitt understood that a small dog snapping at a man's ankles will prevent his onward march as effectually as a stout gate and half-a-dozen men to guard it; had he realised that, by a frank and determined effort in La Vendée, in alliance with those Frenchmen who were bitter against the murderers of their priests and their king, or even at Toulon, where the spirit of the royalists was strong, he might have a better chance of saving Holland than by the attempt that was being made in Belgium, something might have been effected; but even as it was, something very much to the purpose might have been done if the Austrian and Prussian Governments had been honest in their professions of hostility to the Revolution.

Five thousand men, even such as they were, but rapidly becoming soldiers, though not much by themselves, would have been a 'respectable and powerful' reinforcement to the army which, unaided, could win the battle of Neerwinden; with the addition of the Prussians, still more. There seem, in fact, at this time, to have been upwards of 150,000 troops, Austrian and Prussian, 14,000 Hanoverian in the pay of England, gathered in or near the scene of action; sufficient to have driven the then irregular and undisciplined levies of France out of Belgium and to the farther side of Paris. But the mutual jealousy of the Austrians and Prussians prevented anything like concerted measures; and their one point of agreement—the desire to share in the spoliation of Poland—effectually damped their action in the Low Countries.

'Just one week before the execution of Louis XVI. five Prussian columns crossed the borders of Poland. This act aroused a furious outcry, especially as Frederick William preluded it by a manifesto hypocritically dwelling upon the danger of allowing Jacobinism to take root in Poland.'

Pitt sought and obtained assurances from both Petersburg and Berlin, that no partition was intended; in cynical disregard of which—says Dr. Rose—'the two Powers laid their 'plans for the act of robbery which took place a few months 'later.' In this, Austria rather doubtingly acquiesced, conditionally on being assisted in her desire to exchange Belgium for Bavaria and possibly also to obtain parts of Alsace and

Lorraine. In yielding to George III.'s wish that his son, the Duke of York, should command the English contingent, Pitt was, no doubt, hoping that he might, by his high rank, take command of the whole army; as he probably would have done, had the army been one in sentiment and purpose. But it was not; as an army it was useless, and we would entirely agree with Mr. Fortescue that much more might have been accomplished by 60,000 good British troops, acting alone, under a competent commander. Where we differ is in thinking that these 60,000 troops might have been forthcoming, if Pitt had not 'throughout his administration studiously neglected 'both the Navy and Army.'

For the want of the 60,000 men was not due to any neglect of Pitt's or of any other Minister, but to the fixed resolve of the English people that they would not endure an army in time of peace. They had had a bitter knowledge of one ground into them in the middle of the seventeenth century, and the memory of it long survived. No experience of the consequent danger—which by good fortune had always been eventually overcome; or of the cost—which when it had been paid or turned into consols, was speedily forgotten, or attributed to any other cause than the real one—could convince them of the folly of such a course; and every war, from the time of William III. downward, had found them unprepared, unable to take an initiative, and forced to undergo such indignities or losses as a better prepared enemy could inflict.

If this had been so during the past century even when war appeared imminent, much more would it have been so during the first years of Pitt's administration, when no hostile cloud darkened the horizon, and when Pitt knew his own fixed intention to have peace. It takes much to convince a man determined on peace, that he may not always have the option of maintaining it; and Pitt had this weakness—that he continued to believe the war was an unfortunate accident or misunderstanding, capable of a speedy settlement.

The declaration found him unprepared as regards the army; and even as regards the navy, though he had three times—in 1787, 1790, 1791—found himself obliged to rely on its assistance, and though, according to the testimony of Sir Byam Martin, himself an ex-comptroller and the son of a comptroller of the Navy, 'neither sparing money nor means in the accomplishment 'of so vital a matter as bringing the fleet into a state to main-'tain the high standing of the country'; though 'it was no 'uncommon thing for him to visit the Navy Office to discuss 'naval matters with the comptroller and to see the returns

'made from the yards, of the progress in building and repairing 'the ships of the line'; and though we know from the letters of Lord Barham, actually comptroller of the Navy, that he took a warm interest in naval affairs—it is still clear that while attending, in this way, to the *matériel* of the navy, he had left on one side or to the discretion of a not always competent Admiralty, the *personnel*, as a thing of less importance; so that, on the outbreak of the war and through its continuance, the raising of men was and remained a most difficult problem. It is familiar knowledge that inattention to the modest wishes of the seamen for increased pay and increased comfort, according to the standard of the age, led to that discontent which resulted in the mutiny at Spithead and gave a colourable pretext to the mutiny at the Nore. It is, perhaps, not so generally known 'that 'there was sporadic mutiny in all quarters until 1798, and far 'more than we are aware of even until the end of the war.'

There can be little doubt that if in the spring of 1793, Great Britain could have thrown anything like 60,000 good soldiers into Belgium, they could have marched to Paris without serious difficulty or opposition. Whether that would have ended the war, is quite another question, which it is difficult to answer; but the whole idea rests on her being able, in the first place, to land the 60,000 men. If she could have done that, it would have been by acting contrary to the principles which had guided her actions so long; and it is as easy to picture to ourselves many other contingencies which would have answered the same purpose—the moderation of the Czarina, for instance; or good government and a strong army in Poland; or the extinction of Danzig and Thorn; an amiable and loving concord between Austria and Prussia, and a dozen other things each as possible and probable as the reversal of England's military policy.

Much might be said about the conduct of the war in detail, but the limits of space forbid it, and we can only refer to this, Mr. Fortescue's latest volume, interesting in spite of the drawbacks which we have mentioned, as giving, in connexion with his larger work, a fuller and more reasoned story of the military operations than can easily be found elsewhere. But through it all, we find traces of a virtual antagonism to Pitt; the attribution to him of the blame for failures with which he had little to do, or for negligences which were clearly outside his province. It is not for the Prime Minister to prescribe the details of a war, or of every operation in it. It is as much as can be expected from him if, ordering the grand outlines, he keeps up an intelligent interest in their execution. Mr. Fortescue

thus seems to hold Pitt primarily responsible for Hood's failing to hold Toulon, forgetting as he does so that while the French could communicate with Paris in three days, the communication of the English with London was a matter of weeks; forgetting that the allies who could and should have sent trustworthy troops did not do so, and that others sent troops which could not be trusted.

His judgement on Hood's temper is grossly exaggerated, apparently on the evidence of Sir John Moore's journal, which is in such respect valueless; nor does he seem to be aware of the continual attempts that were made by Spaniards and Neapolitans to deny his authority, if not to take the command from him; or of Hood's conviction that Langara was in secret correspondence with Robespierre. Such things are apt to try the temper of even a sweet-tempered man, and Hood was far from being that. He had not arrived at that height of wisdom which would have enabled him to suffer fools gladly. Mr. Fortescue seems to think that Hood was not the man for the place; but quite independent of that, his opinion that 'Pitt should have abandoned all other projects and sent every 'British soldier that he could raise to Toulon' seems very questionable. Dr. Rose's lay judgement on the merits of the case is, we think, sounder. He points out

'that at Toulon the sea power is at the mercy of the land power. To attempt to defend that city at the head of its land-locked harbour, dominated by promontories, was to court disaster unless the fleet had an army to protect it. . . . Toulon cannot be held by an enemy unless he brings forces sufficient to hold the neighbouring heights. In occupying Toulon the sea power was virtually putting its head into the lion's jaw. Only by degrees did the authorities at home understand this all-important fact.'

There was a further difficulty in the way of holding Toulon not theoretically insuperable, but which was, none the less, practically very great. The occupation of Toulon by a foreign power, or a combination of foreign powers, roused all that was best, as well as all that was worst, in the French character. Such a pollution of the sacred soil could not be tolerated, and the French forces that assembled before Toulon would take 'a 'deal of beating.' Pitt indeed saw—perhaps not in its full value, but to some extent—the need of troops at the different places which Mr. Fortescue has pointed out. He hoped—with undue trust in his neighbours and so-called allies—to be able to furnish them. Even while Hood, as far as he knew, was still on his way to the Gulf of Lyons he expressed a hope that the two fleets, English and Spanish, with the assistance of

Sardinian, Neapolitan, and Austrian troops, might 'do some-'thing material' in the south of France; and a month later, when he supposed that Hood was still blockading Toulon, he wrote in 'a sanguine memorandum' that by June 1794 there 'ought to be available, for service against France, 30,000 in 'Flanders, while 50,000 marched thence on Paris, 50,000 to attack 'Brest, and as many more to attack Toulon.' Pitt is not to be blamed because the allies did not produce the troops they had promised; but he might fairly be blamed, severely blamed, for his credulity in believing and acting on the promise of governments which, time and again, had proved false. If anything like the forces enumerated could have been mustered in the summer of 1794, or still better in the autumn of 1793, the end of the war in the victory of the allies would have been certain. As it was, the troops were not collected then; afterwards it was too late; and the war ran on for nearly a quarter of a century.

It is in this—the inability to turn large numbers of men on to the strategic point—that the charges against Pitt as an incompetent War Minister almost entirely rest. Not content with one point, there are always several points at which—it is said—attack ought to have been made by large English armies, ready and presumably capable of sweeping the locality. That means good, well-disciplined soldiers, in numbers often put at 60,000, but which, multiplied as demanded, may be anything from 120,000 to a quarter of a million. The most favoured way of supporting this or other similar charge is by suggesting a comparison of him with his father, the elder Pitt, or with Marlborough. This should be met. It is Macaulay who—as far as the modern public is concerned—most distinctly formulated these charges in a direct way.

'Parliament—he tells us—was even more ready to grant him [Pitt] men and money than he was to ask for them. In such an emergency, and with such means, such a statesman as Richelieu, as Louvois, as Chatham, as Wellesley, would have created in a few months one of the finest armies in the world, and would soon have discovered and brought forward generals worthy to command such an army. Germany might have been saved by another Blenheim; Flanders recovered by another Ramillies.'

Richelieu and Louvois are in such a connexion mere high-sounding names, having nothing whatever to do with it; though incidentally it may be remarked that Richelieu preferred waging war with the weapons of the Swede, and that neither he nor Louvois had to consult the will of a House of Commons. The elder Pitt, whom it is convenient to call Chatham, seems a more proper comparison. What then did Chatham do?

Did he raise large armies? If so, what became of them? At Closter-Seven

'the Duke of Cumberland . . . was at the head of a motley army of scarce 50,000 men; there were no English beyond the officers of his personal staff, but, beside the native Hanoverians, he had several regiments of Prussians; he had also Hessians, Brunswickers, and many other mercenaries hired from the smaller princes of Northern Germany.' *

The army that was *not* thrown on shore at Rochefort numbered 7800 men; the forces employed against Cherbourg and St. Malo were under 10,000; for the reduction of Belle Isle, 9000. We look in vain in Europe for any English army of 60,000 men. In America, the land forces at the reduction of Louisbourg were under 12,000, including 317 artillery men, while the naval force consisted of about 15,000 men with 1900 guns, large and small. The regular troops at the capture of Ticonderoga were 6354, to which were added some 5300 colonial levies. At Quebec—the most noted success of Chatham's administration and on which perhaps his reputation chiefly depends—there were, all told, 4870 soldiers; of sailors and marines, there were in the fleet, 15,590. If Chatham ever raised his 100,000 men, what did he do with them? Where did he set an example which Pitt ought to have followed?

The fact really is that Pitt followed very closely the methods of his father; he hired foreigners, he subsidised foreign princes. The difference was that in Chatham's case these were obliged to fight the common enemy. It was not by choice, but of necessity, that Frederick the Great fought the French at Rossbach, or the Austrians at Leuthen or Torgau; but he was only able to defeat them by the subsidies which Chatham was paying to him. It may well be that, taught by the example which had won his father such fame, and whom all men commended, William Pitt lavished subsidies on Frederick William, Leopold or Francis, which they, having the option, diverted to other uses—such as partitioning Poland. In any case the result was that the recipients of Chatham's subsidies fought and defeated England's enemies, and the English people gave Chatham a large part of the credit. Those whom Pitt subsidised cheated him, cheated England, did not fight the common enemy, and left Pitt to bear the blame in the opinion of a large number of Englishmen. His failure, such as it is, may be attributed to his early education, in which he had not learnt the truth of the Psalmist's bitter outcry that 'All men are liars.'

* Lord Stanhope's 'History of England' (cabinet edit.), iv. 116.

But Pitt, we are told, was so utterly ignorant of men that those he appointed to high command proved utterly incompetent. Of course it might be replied that he had very little to do with appointments beyond approval or a possible veto, and that in the navy the appointments so made had proved exceptionally good. Howe, Hood, Jervis, Nelson were all appointed to high command in his time, though, as in the army, not by him. To the personnel of the navy, as has been said, he paid little attention. It was not his province, and the surest way to break down any administration is for its chief to attempt the duties of his subordinates. Neither was that of the army, as far as we know; the Duke of York was certainly nominated by the king, in opposition to the judgement of Pitt or Dundas. Of all others, Sir Charles Stuart is picked out by Mr. Fortescue as by far the most competent English soldier whom the Revolutionary war brought to light; and the modern reputation of Sir Ralph Abercromby rests, mainly, on his death in the hour of victory. Neither of them was known to the public or to Europe as a leader of armies; neither of them had the chance. But who were the men on whose great renown and singular capacity the reputation of Chatham is so largely built? Who were the great generals—not of the non-existing armies but of the small bodies of men with which they worked? The Duke of Cumberland, who was sent to Germany partly in obedience to the king's wish, partly because he had won the battle of Culloden—though he had previously lost Fontenoy, and afterwards had been defeated at Lauffeld, was one. Who were the others? The Duke of Marlborough, Lord George Sackville, Sir John Mordaunt, Loudon, Robert Abercromby? Wolfe alone is known, and from the numbers just quoted it may be judged whether his extraordinary fame is not chiefly due to his glorious death, or to the importance of the advantage secured by it. Certainly the happy command of a small contingent of less than 5000 men does not raise a man to the level of the greatest generals.

As to the naval commanders of the war—Hawke, Boscawen, Saunders, Osborn, who might almost be called the founders of our world-empire, as well as of Chatham's reputation —Chatham had little or nothing to do with their appointment, and indeed the relations between him and Hawke were never cordial. But when this form of war is taken into account, it does seem as if the younger Pitt had at least an approving voice in the appointment of Howe, Hood, Jervis, Nelson, whose fame and glory parallel, if they do not transcend, those of their earlier brothers in arms. As to Marlborough, there can

be no comparison: for many years he was practically the dictator of England's foreign as well as military policy, but even so he does not seem to have ever had under his command more than about 12,000 Englishmen—certainly not at Blenheim or Ramillies.

An interesting and important point which critics are apt to overlook is the very different quality of the enemies with whom the younger Pitt and his father had to contend, no less than the very different sentiment of their allies. Macaulay has indeed noticed it, and curiously enough seems to have thought that it deepened the blackness of Pitt's shortcomings. His words are:

'He was obstinately blind to the plain fact that the new quarrel between England and France was of quite a different kind from the old quarrels about colonies in America and fortresses in the Netherlands. He had to combat frantic enthusiasm, boundless ambition, restless activity, the wildest and most audacious spirit of innovation; and he acted as if he had to deal with the harlots and fops of the old Court of Versailles, [with Madame de Pompadour and the Abbé de Bernis.'

Mr. Fortescue, on the other hand, is quick to note that the French seamen of the Revolution were of a lower quality than those of the former war. This is an established fact, but it has never been shown that—much as it might tell on the strategy of a campaign—it had any influence on the tactics or the issue of the great battles, while it is beyond a doubt that the increase in the *élan* of the French soldiers and the genius of Bonaparte, not to mention his less renowned fellows, were most important factors in the French victories.

Much has been said, much might still be said, about the repressive policy which Pitt considered himself forced to adopt in relation to sedition-mongers, potential traitors, and would-be Jacobins. That the first of these did pour out to the public much sedition by word of mouth, by leaflets, or by more serious publications was sufficiently evident; there was no doubt of the traitorous designs of the second, and when they proceeded to overt action, stoning or trying to stone the king, and smashing up the state carriage; when the third adopted the policy of inviting a French invasion and of sending to France lists and stations of ships and troops that could oppose such invasion, it appeared to Pitt's government time to interfere. A wet summer, a bad harvest, the price of wheat trebled, lack of employment, and war taxes would seem to explain much of the unrest. The true Jacobin sympathisers were apparently a very small minority, and might, it has been argued, have been

left to die out, or to be put an end to by public opinion. But 'the heart knoweth his own bitterness,' or, in current language, 'every man knows best where his own shoe pinches;' and it does not by any means follow that such measures as would be adopted now, in the twentieth century, or which commended themselves to Macaulay in the middle of the nineteenth, could have been safely or prudently relied on in the closing years of the eighteenth.

With the awful example of France before them, no Ministers would have been justified to their own consciences in tampering with the forms of sedition and rebellion which were openly advocated, and—in their worst form—put in actual practice in Ireland. That the Acts which of necessity were hastily passed told harshly in individual cases must be admitted; but in almost all, if indeed not absolutely all, of them the condemned person or party had been guilty of what—in the eye of the law—appeared to be connivance. The law respecting an accessory to a crime is very far-reaching, and mercilessly applies the adage 'noscitur a sociis.' There was then neither time nor inclination to split hairs about the guilt or innocence of the associates of traitors, or of the upholders of theoretical treason, and it may be doubted whether the strongest supporters of freedom of speech, whether Fox himself, would have acted very differently had they or he been in a position of responsibility.

It is impossible to discuss the question of Ireland and Irish affairs in the concluding paragraph of an article mainly devoted to a consideration of Pitt's foreign policy and his conduct of the war. It must be enough for the present to state what Pitt wished to do and what he did. As early as 1785 he had seen the desirability of a commercial union between the two islands; but this had been negatived by the jealousy and the opposition of the English manufacturers and traders. It is well to remark that the Manchester district which, towards the middle of the next century, led the way in the opposition to Protection and attempted to lay down economic laws as to the absurdity and iniquity of such a thing, was at this time foremost in the contention that anything like free trade with Ireland was hostile to the interests of Great Britain and could not be allowed. Commercial feuds, religious feuds, and feuds of other origin followed. It is one of the pleasing fictions of present day agitators that the 'Grattan' Parliament was an 'Irish' institution and that the lifetime of the Grattan Parliament was a time of 'Peace, Concord and Good Will' till the Hell-Born Minister stirred up discord in the country, with the intention of forcing it to adopt his cherished project of a Union. All

this, Dr. Rose has no difficulty in showing, is in direct variance with all evidence. In November 1792, before the outbreak of the war with France, but when the Ministers were beginning to see that it could not be avoided, Pitt wrote to Lord Westmoreland, the Lord Lieutenant :

'The idea of the present fermentation gradually bringing both parties to think of an union with this country, has long been in my mind. I hardly dare flatter myself with the hope of its taking place ; but I believe it, though itself not easy to be accomplished, to be the only solution for other and greater difficulties. The admission of Catholics to a share of suffrage could not then be dangerous. The Protestant interest, in point of power, property and Church establishment, would be secure, because the decided majority of the supreme Legislature would necessarily be Protestant ; and the great ground of argument on the part of the Catholics would be done away, as, compared with the rest of the Empire, they would become a minority.'

This is sufficiently clear as to Pitt's idea at that time. No doubt as the years passed on, and the fantastic ideas of the Revolutionary party developed, so also did Pitt's idea of the extent of a Union, which had been formerly a mere commercial union. It seems possible that if this had been then adopted, it might have allayed the discontent in Ireland, have enriched its poverty and laid the foundations of a real and enduring union of hearts. Pitt now judged that something far beyond this was required to ensure at once peace and commercial prosperity ; and in June 1798, while the rebellion was in full swing, he outlined his ideas to Lord Camden, the then Lord Lieutenant. Pitt's letter, Dr. Rose tells us, is missing, but we can judge of its contents by Lord Camden's answer to it, which among other things lays stress on the danger of Protestant interests being subjected to Catholic. In a separate Irish Parliament, a Representative Parliament of Ireland, they would be ; in a United Parliament, the Catholics would always be in a minority.

As the scheme took definite form, a very practical difficulty stood out in opposition to it. The election to the Irish House of Commons had been no more free than that to the English. The bulk of the members were nominees, and each constituency represented a certain income to its patron. As in the English Reform Bill of 1785, Pitt judged that vested rights should be respected. There were also many sinecures held under a separate Government which would be abolished ; there again, vested interests ought, in Pitt's judgement, to be recognised. It is only right to say that, joined to these, there was something that bore an unpleasant resemblance to 'bribery,' but might

more properly be called 'purchase.' But even calling it by the unsavoury name, it was made use of to overcome an opposition of party or faction, not of Ireland, and there was a very great deal less than has been supposed. Dr. Rose thus explains it:

'Downshire, the most influential opponent of the Union, had opened a fund for influencing members of Parliament. It reached a large amount, probably 100,000*l.* Beresford, in a letter to Auckland, states that 4000*l.* was paid to win over a supporter of Government. Pitt believed that Downshire's fund necessitated the extensive use of bribery by Government. But it is on the whole more likely that Dublin Castle opened the game by its request early in 1799, for 5000*l.* immediately from London.'

With the correspondence relative to this before him, Dr. Rose says:

'It is absurd to deny that Pitt used corrupt means to carry the Union. He used them, because only so could he carry through that corrupt Parliament a measure entailing pecuniary loss on most of its members. "I despise and hate myself every hour," so Cornwallis wrote, "for engaging in such dirty work, and am supported only by the reflection that without an Union, the British Empire must be dissolved."'

There cannot be a reasonable doubt that the Irish Parliament was rightly done away with. It was excessively corrupt; though claiming to represent a Catholic country, it was entirely Protestant, and though Irish in origin it was anything but Irish in sentiment. To reform it by the admission of Catholics would, it was thought, put the Irish Protestants under the heel of the Catholics. That project would also have been violently opposed, and could only have been effected by a similar or probably a larger use of bribery. The Union, as carried through, was the child of Pitt's judgement and experience, and time might have mellowed and improved it; but it never had a fair trial; and its probabilities of success were damned from the first by the refusal of the well-meaning, but wrong-headed King to admit one of its most important clauses. With its later history, Pitt had no concern.

And here we may properly bid farewell to the man who for so many years piloted the ship of State through a stormy sea and intricate navigation. We must leave untouched the story of his social and family and familiar life, of his lovable and loving nature—almost hidden in his devotion to the public service, of his inclinations to marriage and of his early death. All of these are daintily described by Dr. Rose, and may safely be left in his keeping.

Art. IX.—RUSSO-CHINESE RELATIONS (A.D. 1224–1912).

1. *China. Imperial Maritime Customs.* III. Miscellaneous Series, No. 30. Treaties, Conventions, etc., between China and Foreign States. Shanghai. 1908.

2. *Treaties between the Empire of China and Foreign Powers.* (1st edit. By W. F. Mayers. 1877.) 5th edition. Shanghai. 1906.

3. *The International Relations of the Chinese Empire. The Period of Conflict* (1834–1860). By Hosea Ballou Morse. 1911.

4. *China. Her History, Diplomacy and Commerce.* By E. H. Parker. 1901.

5. *Arsenieff, U. V.* Introduction to Spathary's 'Siberian Journey.' St. Petersburg. 1882.

6. *Materials, etc.* Privately printed by the Russian General Staff. 1882–1891.

7. *Vassilieff, V. P.* Otkritie Kitaya, etc. St. Petersburg. 1900.

When last February the world was startled by the threatened rupture between Russia and China, the phrase 'secular friendship' was freely used in the Western European press to characterise the supposed mutual relations of these two Powers in the past. The Russian Foreign Office itself spoke, in a somewhat lower key, of 'the friendly relations 'which have long existed between Russia and China' and 'friendly and neighbourly relations based upon treaties.' Diplomatically, no doubt, such language is quite justifiable: it is, indeed, a good example of what the Chancelleries love to call 'correct.' But, in quite plain English, there has never been any friendship between Russia and China. Their relations have been from the first more or less unfriendly, save at periods when they were practically in abeyance; to the truth of which statement the pages that follow bear ample witness. We shall see that relationship can only be said to have begun when Manchu and Moscovite came together on the Amoor (A.D. 1644)—and came to blows. In the fighting that took place the Russians were defeated; and in the diplomatic negotiations that followed they suffered humiliation and loss. Thenceforward, up to 1858, any advantages or concessions they obtained from the Court of Peking were flung to them as a bone is flung to a dog—by someone who does not like dogs.

Since then Russia has improved her position very greatly and she has done so, mainly, by taking advantage—quite legitimately—of the straits to which China has at various times been reduced, as a result of internal troubles or of quarrels with foreign Powers, either or both of which contingencies she is on the alert to profit by now. But never at any time can it truly be said that the relations between the Courts of Moscow (later St. Petersburg) and Peking were, save in a 'diplomatic' sense, friendly. Many times, on the other hand, they have been acutely the reverse and they may be so again at any moment. It is true that much the same may be said of other Powers; but in the case of Russia, as we propose to make plain in greater detail before closing this review, it is not merely a question of protecting her subjects and safeguarding her commercial interests: Russia, thanks to her geographical position, must take a hand, whether she will or no, in the settlement of those racial and even religious—apart from merely national—questions brought to the front by the present crisis in China. Her own future may be largely influenced by the events now occurring and the line she decides to take; these, in turn, cannot fail to affect the fortunes of other Powers and, notably, in one direction at least, those of Great Britain.

It was the Mongol conquest of both, that first brought Russia and China into touch. Jenghis Khan in A.D. 1215 took Yenking, where Peking was afterwards built, and nine years later his armies overran Russia. In 1234 his sons put an end to the Kin domination in Northern China. But it was only in 1279 that, after ten years hard fighting, Kublai Khan finally, in Polo's time, conquered the country the Italian traveller calls Manjin—roughly China south of the Hoang-ho or Yellow River, whereupon the Sung dynasty likewise came to an end. For a brief period, less than a century, the Mongols ruled not only all China in the widest acceptation of the term, but by far the most extensive sovereignty the world has ever seen. During this time, as Professor Parker tells us, Russian Imperial Guards are frequently mentioned at the Mongol Court of Pekin, but after the middle of the fourteenth century 'not 'one single word touching Russia appears in Chinese history 'during the whole interval between the disappearance of the 'Mongols (1368) and the rise of the Manchus (1644).' But whilst the Mongols reigned these Imperial Guards whose existence has been ignored by most, if not all, other writers, were not the only Russians in China. Rubruquis met some at Karakorum, and that dread period in Russian history saw the descendants of Rurik grovelling at the feet of successive Great

Khans on the banks (it is said) of the river Amoor, or at Cambalic (again Peking) itself, as they did later, at Serai on the Volga, and wherever else the lords of the Golden Horde held court. That chapter, the story how the Russian princes humbled themselves for their master's favour, how they intrigued one against another and even fought and slew each other at his bidding, until by superior baseness and treachery the Moscow line achieved supremacy, is perhaps as lamentable as any in history. But, in the event, modern Russia emerged triumphant, so that before Ivan the Terrible died in 1584, though the Crim Tartars were still formidable in the South, the conquest of Kazan (1552) and Astrakhan (1554) had opened the way eastwards and made of the Volga and Kama a Russian highway, up which Yermak sailed to the conquest of Siberia in 1579.

It is perhaps a pardonable error if in Western Europe, where Russian history and, indeed, things Russian in general have been, and are so greatly neglected, this Yermak expedition is looked upon somewhat in the light of the Spanish invasion of the New World; that is to say, as an irruption into an unknown land peopled by races hitherto undreamed of by the invaders. It was nothing of the sort. From the thirteenth century when their princes perforce made the eastward journey, on to the sixteenth, though naturally enough the record is blank, the Russians must necessarily have had knowledge, however slight and vague, of the country and peoples that lay east of Moscow. For there was no hard line of division between them. Rivers are none, even when not fast frozen and passable on foot during six months at least of every year; mountains may be more formidable, it is true, but the Urals barely touch 5000 feet at their highest points and sink to comparative insignificance in between. The only real impediments were the nature of the country beyond them—largely forest and bog—and the hostility of the inhabitants. The former constituted no insuperable barrier; the latter even furnished a means to knowledge. For during the centuries that elapsed from Baty to Yermak thousands upon thousands of prisoners must have been made reciprocally and some degree of mutual knowledge as to the circumstances obtaining on either side was bound to result. We may fairly assume that the minimum of information regarding Siberia to be attributed to the Russians at any time since the Mongol invasion is that beyond the line of the Urals lay a vast forest region, watered by huge rivers and inhabited by tribes not differing greatly from those nearer home—Cheremises, Voguls, etc.—living like them by

hunting and fishing and like them subject to 'Tartar' princes. And gradually as the Moscovites made way against their enemies, finding to the east the line of least resistance, that knowledge must have grown. In any case it is a fact that in 1555, a quarter of a century before Yermak, Yesdigird, Khan of Siberia, paid tribute to Moscow at the rate of 1000 sables yearly; and Ivan the Terrible, in 1563 in a document addressed to the King of Poland, styles himself 'Siberian Tsar.' This it is that enables us to understand what might otherwise well seem incomprehensible, namely that already in 1567, while the future 'Conqueror of Siberia' was still an outlaw with a price on his head, people sent by the Tsar, his master, made their way tranquilly enough through Siberia and Mongolia and penetrated even to the Court of the Mings at Peking.

This first Russian mission to China in modern times was in no sense an Embassy; the Moscovite rulers were too cautious in those days to court a rebuff or worse—but merely an exploring expedition headed by the two Cossacks, Petroff and Yalicheff, who were instructed to find out all they could in regard to neighbouring kingdoms, languages, peoples and districts; their distances from Moscow and from the Moscovite borders. Moreover they were to extend these enquiries to 'the kingdom of China, the land of the Mongols and the great 'river Ob,' the sources of which it was thought might be found within the boundaries of the Chinese Empire. The Cossacks' report begins only from the further frontier of Siberia on the river Abakan, whence the route lay, as often since, by Ubsa Nor through the realm of the Golden King. They seem to have reached Peking by way of Kalgan, but, not having gifts (tribute) with them, they were dismissed with a letter from the Emperor to the Tsar without being admitted to his presence.

But even before this, as we learn from Mendez Pinto, there were Moscovites in China in the suite of an ambassador from the Emperor of Caran (Carão, probably Kazan), 60 degrees further west, to one of several Mongol rulers who bore in succession the title of 'small Prince' though, in fact, as Professor Parker tells us, they were in, apparently, permanent possession of the whole line outside the Wall and were perpetually raiding from Kokonor to Peking itself. This particular 'small Prince' had 100,000 men at his disposal and the Portuguese traveller found him (A.D. 1544) engaged in an attempt to take the Northern Capital. Winter coming on the siege was raised and the Mongol retired to his own country, where he was met by many Princes and Envoys, amongst them this ambassador in whose train were tall blond

men from the 'land called Moscoby,' armed with long broad-bladed swords, and wearing robes lined with sable. If, as Pinto relates, they used, occasionally, Latin words, repeating, for instance, *Dominus* three times whenever they yawned they may well have been Poles or Lithuanians in the service of the Khan of Kazan, whose kingdom was then on the eve of its downfall, and who may have sought aid from the Mongols in the hope of averting that fate which befell him eight years later. A few pages further on we are told of some novel artillery furnished by 'people who call themselves Alimanis 'from a country called Moscoo'—probably Germans or Scandinavians who had come through Russia.

The immediate results of Petroff's and Yalicheff's expedition were slight and a period of forty years elapsed before the next attempt, of which we have any knowledge, to penetrate beyond the Russian frontier in those parts; but it is probable that the experience thus gained was not without its influence on the future. In the later years of his reign, Ivan IV. may well have had his thoughts elsewhere and the 'time of trouble' that followed soon after was not one to allow of any such distant adventures. Theodore Ivanovitch, indeed, offered to Poland, amongst other things, as the price of an alliance, free passage for Lithuanian or Polish merchants 'into Siberia 'and the great Empire of China, in which are found all sorts of 'precious stones and gold'; and, later, Boris Godunoff promised help to the English in their efforts to get to China, presumably by sea. But it is not until 1608 that we hear again of an actual attempt to reach Peking—an abortive attempt it is true, but one that is not without interest. For this was avowedly a trading embassy to the Golden King with whose good help it was hoped to reach China, and for the first time the plan was adopted of forming a government caravan, as being less liable to attack and pillage on the way—a system maintained until the end of the eighteenth century, when the Russian Government was at last driven, much to its own real advantage, to allow the Kiakhta merchants to trade on their own account, by the repeated closing of the caravan road in consequence of boundary and other disputes with the Chinese.

In 1616 the Cossacks, Tumenets and Petroff, were despatched by the Voivoda of Tobolsk on the same errand. They failed to reach China, but spent some time at the Court of the Altin (Golden) King or Khan on the shores of Ubsa Nor, and their verbal report, taken down on their return to Tobolsk and still extant in the original, is full of interest. The Golden King, whose power by this time was much on the wane, not only

received them well, but agreed to become tributary to the Tsar of Moscovy. The Cossacks made diligent enquiries as to the road to China, and the information they gathered was so full and favourable that in 1619, in spite of the fear and suspicion of Moscow, the local Voivoda, Prince Kurákin, sent out another party of Cossacks, headed by Petlin and Mundoff, which, by the same route, past Ubsa Nor, succeeded in reaching Peking. The record of this journey was first published by Purchas in English under the title of 'A relation of two Russe 'Cossacks travailes out of Siberia to Catay and other countries 'adjoining thereto.'*

Through some confusion the report of this mission is in parts so exactly a repetition of Petroff's account of fifty years before, that most authorities, including Karamzin, refused to believe that Petlin and his companion ever reached Peking. This attitude is maintained by Henning even in our own time (1905), but Arsenieff's evidence, of which no doubt the former was unaware, is quite conclusive. In the Moscow archives may still be seen Prince Kurákin's report on the subject to the Tsar Michael in 1820, in which he writes:

'This year arrived in Tobolsk out of the Chinese Empire (the word used is *Gosudarstvo*, "State," but in the seventeenth century this is habitually employed by other envoys to China for "capital" i.e. Peking), and from the Altin Khan, the Tomsk soldiers, Ivaskho Petlin and Andriushka Mundoff, and with them fare to thee, Gosudar, envoys from the kingdom of Laha and from the Altin-Tsar and from the Kirghiz, with gifts; and in advance of the envoys we have sent to thee, Gosudar, Ivashko Petlin and Piatunka Kizil and by them we have forwarded to thee, Gosudar, from the Chinese Tsar Taibin, a letter, and from the Altin-Tsar a translation of a letter and a map, and a relation of what places Ivashko Petlin and Andriushka Mundoff went through on the way from Tomsk to China, and in what other countries they have been.'

In the Altin Khan's letter he confirms the fact that they have been to the Chinese capital, whence they were dismissed with all satisfaction. And we may add that in Spathary's report of his embassy to China, preserved in the Moscow F.O. archives, a Russian version is given of the Chinese Emperor's letter—sent by Petlin, but never deciphered till Spathary took it back to Peking in 1676 and had it translated by the well-known Jesuit, Verbiest. More might be said of the relations between the Russians and the Golden Kings, whose feet alas! soon proved to be of clay, but space forbids. Doubtless we shall soon hear

* Pilgrimes, 1625, iii. 797.

very interesting things about the region they once ruled over from the Carruthers expedition.

We now come to Baikoff (the Backhoff, Bashkoff, Baicouf of English, American and French writers), who was sent as envoy in 1654 (not 1653 as sometimes stated) from Moscow to Peking, but still only for trade purposes. He took with him a small caravan of government goods in charge of a Cossack and a Bukharan. Baikoff, himself, was illiterate and incapable of conducting political negotiations with such past-masters as the Chinese, had any such been entrusted to him. His mission, such as it was, failed, thanks to his sturdy refusal to *kowtow* or deliver his credentials to any but the Great Khan in person, thus contributing to the long series of disputes on that question begun by the Arab envoy in 713 A.D., and ended only by the Memorandum on ceremonial annexed to the Peace Protocol signed at Peking on the 7th of September 1901.

The accounts of Baikoff's mission are unfortunately very meagre and hopelessly confused ; indeed at one time the fact of his arrival at Peking and dismissal for contumacy was doubted, but it is categorically confirmed by Nieuhoff, Secretary to the Dutch Embassy of Goyer and Keyser there at the time, who records both his arrival in March 1656 and his dismissal on the 14th of September of the same year.

At the beginning of the seventeenth century China was still almost entirely unknown to Russia, though Western Europe, thanks chiefly to the Jesuits, had to some extent broken through the barrier of ignorance ; but the absorption of Siberia proceeded so rapidly that already in 1636 the Russians had reached the sea of Okhotsk ; they had probably even then heard tell of the great river that ran south of their newest possessions ; and the inevitable contact and conflict with China was at hand.

The first Emperor of the present dynasty ascended the Dragon throne in 1644, and by a pregnant coincidence, the Russians made their first appearance on the Amoor (Hei-lung-chiang, the Black Dragon River) the same year. Gold, in which all that region abounds, had not yet been found ; but a no less powerful lure existed in the sable-skin, a gift of Heaven to Manchuria her sons declare—the veritable golden-fleece of Jason, as one of the early Russian envoys to China gravely assures us. And indeed the part played by this precious commodity in Russia's eastward march and in her early relations with China can hardly be exaggerated. The sable it was that drew the adventurers on, that paid their perils, excused their misdeeds. To the Moscovite Court the new

dominions were chiefly of value for the tribute in fur, and local officials, traders, Cossacks, exiles, criminals—all vied one with another in the task of wringing this tribute, 'Yassak,' from the unhappy natives, whose treatment, save that religious persecution played no part in it, was no whit better than that of Peruvian or Aztec, at the hands of the Conquistadores. The Manchus, to whom these natives were akin, were alarmed at the rapid progress of the newcomers; they resented the loss of subjects, real or prospective, and of revenue in kind; and no sooner was their hold on China assured than they proceeded to deal drastically with the situation in the North.

Trading caravans having a more or less official status continued, meantime, to be organised and sent forward by the Siberian Voivodas. Perfilieff in 1659, in consequence no doubt of Baikoff's non-success, was even entrusted with a conciliatory letter from the Tsar Alexei Mikhailovitch, but still merely asking for trade facilities. We may assume that he performed the *kowtow*, for he was received by the Great Khan (Shun-chi) and dismissed with the usual presents, including tea, of which he brought ten poods to Moscow, the first overland tea on record, though Starkoff and Nevieroff, envoys to the Altin Khan in 1638, had been regaled with it at Ubsa Nor—'they call 'it chai; I know not whether the leaves of which it is made come 'from a tree or from some herb. They put them in water and 'then add milk to it.' There was still another caravan journey in 1669 (Ablin's) and again one, under Porshennikoff, in 1675, this time by the Urga-Kalgan route, the first description of which was furnished by members of the expedition to Spathary in Yeneseisk on their way back to Moscow. But whereas trade alone had hitherto been the motive on either side political questions now became dominant. Much blood had already been shed on the Sungari and the Amoor itself, but the Manchus believed or affected to believe that they were dealing merely with outlaws and filibusters, and continued to treat the Russians who came to Peking as subjects of a State with which they were at peace. When however it came to a petty Tunguz (Solon) prince, with his whole tribe, going over to the Russians, Kang-hi thought it time to remonstrate. The local (Nerchinsk) Voivoda, Arshinsky, made a terrible mess of the whole business, sending a Cossack, Milovanoff, not even a Russian born, with proposals that Kang-hi should accept Russian sovereignty (1671). The mere suggestion is so monstrous, it shows so total a want of comprehension on the Russian side of the main factors of the case, that one cannot be surprised at the subsequent humiliation of their country. Meantime either Milovanoff or

the Manchu officials (or perhaps the Jesuit interpreters) suppressed the offensive passage—but the frontier trouble continuing, the Tsar in 1675 sent Nicholas Gavrilovitch Spathary to China on the first mission from Moscow to the Court of Peking which can fairly be dignified with the title of embassy. The mission failed, as Baikoff's had done, and partly for the same reason—obstinacy and bad manners, as the Chinese put it—but still more because Spathary brought no answer to Kang-hi's demand that the Solon Prince (Gantimur) with his sable-hunting clan should be given up.

Hostile encounters between the Russians and Manchus, ending in the discomfiture of the former, had, as we say, already occurred on the Amoor and the Sungari; actual warfare broke out in 1683, when Kang-hi for the first time sent an army to the Amoor. The Russians held out heroically at Albazin (Yaksa) and elsewhere, but theirs was a hopeless position, and in 1689 was signed the Treaty of Nerchinsk, by which Russia abandoned all claims on the Amoor—claims never renewed until the Crimean War and subsequent events gave Muravieff, a century and a half later, the opportunity he so brilliantly used.

This Nerchinsk Treaty, exacted literally at the cannon's mouth, was not only the first concluded between China and Russia, but the first between China and any foreign Power. It was essentially a boundary treaty, though free trade between the two countries was also provided for; yet the Chinese made the fatal mistake of leaving the eastern frontier, beyond the line of the Ussuri, for future definition, their only excuse being ignorance of the country; though the Ming Emperors Hun-wu (1368–98) and Yun-lo, in 1413, had sent expeditions to the lower Amoor; built temples there; and erected stone monuments, with inscriptions, that still exist.

Professor Vassilieff takes the view that Golovin, the Russian plenipotentiary, need never have signed this 'shameful' treaty and did so in ignorance of the real situation, but it is difficult to agree with him. It is true that, as Gerbillon tells us, the treaty set Kang-hi free to espouse the cause of the Khalkas and attack the Eleuths (Kalmucks). These people he defeated and ruined as they had ruined the Khalkas; Mongolia came for the first time under the domination of China, and Kang-hi's dominions became co-terminous with those of the Moscovite Tsars from the Altai to the Eastern ocean. But his force at Nerchinsk was sufficient to overwhelm the Russians, and it is difficult to believe that Moscow could in those days have waged war successfully with China. Golovin's subsequent career is a

proof that his action met with full approval at home. He came to Holland and England in 1697–8 together with Lefort and Voznitsin (Peter being with them incognito). He was the first cavalier of the order of St. Andrew established in the latter year; succeeded Lefort as Admiral of Russia on the latter's death; commanded the army at Narva in 1700; was made Chancellor in 1705 and died the following year.

In any case peace was restored and officially has not been broken since—if we except the little unpleasantnesses of 1900—and in 1692 the Tsars Ivan and Peter, then reigning jointly, took advantage of the improved relations between the two countries to send an embassage under Everart Isbrandt Ides to China, the details of whose journey are well known from the ambassador's own account, supplemented by that of his secretary, Adam Brandt, though as to the business they were about and its results, if any, they maintain a discreet silence. In general, Ides so far has enjoyed a great deal of credit that rightly belongs to Spathary, who will, one of these days, come to his own.

But though the Amoor was no longer in question, the trouble on the Argoun and on the Mongolian frontier continued, to the detriment of that trade which seemed yearly more desirable; so that Peter—long sole Tsar—in 1719 sent Captain (not Count) Ismailoff, of his favourite Preobrazhensky regiment, at the head of a large train, as Special Ambassador to Peking, to renew and strengthen the existing friendship. Ismailoff made a favourable impression and was exceptionally well received and treated by Kang-hi, now an old man and near his end; but an unfortunate occurrence, the voluntary transfer of a whole Uluss or clan of Mongols to Russian subjection—an incident repeated quite recently (November 1911) and one which suggests a vast possibility—rendered his mission abortive We have pretty full accounts, though with important omissions, of this embassy from some of its members, John Bell of Antermony, Lorentz, Lange and Unversagt; also, incidentally, from Father Ripa the Jesuit, and others. Kang-hi's long reign came to an end in 1722, the year of Peter's Persian War; the Russian ruler himself died soon after; and, the deadlock continuing in Russo-Chinese trade relations, Catherine I., in 1725, sent the Illyrian Count Sava Lukitch-Vladislavitch Raguzinsky, as Special Ambassador to Peking to relieve the situation and conclude a new treaty, in which, after much labour and trouble, he succeeded.

It is by this treaty of 1725, known as the 'Treaty of Kiakhta,' that the overland trade between Russia and China was first

established on definite foundations, for the general permission on both sides to do business in each other's country, stipulated in the Nerchinsk Treaty, was too wide and vague to form a satisfactory basis for commercial relations. Raguzinsky's work was in some respects very thoroughly done and has not been entirely superseded down to the present day; for the so-called Buren Treaty, referred to more than once in the recent controversy, was part of it. Raguzinsky, though Morse (who quite ignores Spathary) says 'there is no record that 'he reached Peking,' was there from August 1726 to May 1727, during which time he came to an agreement with the Chinese negotiators as to the whole of the points in dispute, leaving the boundary details, only, to be settled locally. All else was embodied in ten articles; but it was agreed that an eleventh should be added dealing with the Mongolian boundary. This article—actually Article III. of the final treaty—comprised (1) the so-called 'Buren' Treaty signed on the banks of the Buren or Bira, a small stream running into the Selinga a little south of the Kiakhta (Bira, Pira is Tunguz for river), and (2) the two protocols rehearsing, as actually delimitated, (*a*) the frontier eastward from the Kiakhta mouth to the Argoun, (*b*) the frontier westward of the same point to Shabina-Dabag, a pass in the Sayan mountains c. 90° 30′ E. of Greenwich. The full treaty was signed not at Kiakhta, which did not then exist, but at Nerchinsk, on the 21st of October (O.S.) 1727, and ratified by the Emperor Peter II. next year, whereupon the town of Kiakhta was founded (1729), though Morse strangely tells us that the 'date is uncertain; it was, however, between 1730 and 1768' (!)

It should perhaps be noticed that Mayers in his 'Treaties 'between the Empire of China and foreign Powers' makes a mistake, recently repeated, in saying that 'this instrument' (i.e. the treaty of 1727) 'abrogates all that had previously 'passed between the two Governments' and 'defines the 'boundaries between their respective territories.' It does this only from Shabina-Dabag to the Argoun; the boundary along that river and up the Shilka to the Gorbitsa and eastward to the Oud remained as defined and guaranteed by the Treaty of Nerchinsk. Mayers, in fact, was misled by the stipulation that 'Ce traité exige qu'il ne soit plus question de ce qui a pu 'avoir lieu antérieurement entre les deux Puissances.' (The Latin text has 'nulla amplius fiet mentio antiquorum inter 'utrumque regnum negotiorum'; the Russian, simply, 'former 'affairs between the two Empires are not to be remembered.') But the immediate context as well as reference to other treaties shows conclusively that this referred to disputes about refugees

and did not and could not mean that the northern frontier, as defined by the Nerchinsk Treaty, was abrogated. On the other hand, the Oud frontier, that is to say the most easterly portion, was again left for future delimitation, a neglect eventually taken advantage of in 1860 by Count Ignatieff.

Notable provisions of the treaty, as Mayers correctly says, are those 'for the despatch of trading expeditions once in 'every three years to Peking; the residence of a Russian 'ecclesiastical mission there, the mode of correspondence 'and the rendition of fugitive subjects on either side.' Of these four the first was the most fruitful, though the restrictions made by the Russian Government itself in its desire to monopolise trade hampered it severely for more than half a century. It is to be noted that the Russian prisoners of the seventeenth century took their 'Orthodox' religion with them to Peking, where by the tolerance of Kang-hi they were allowed to worship freely in their own church of St. Nicholas (their descendants were to be distinguished until quite recently). Raguzinsky with Chinese help built a new church, dedicated to the Virgin. The mission he established exists to this day, and besides looking after the spiritual affairs of Russians in China—though Prof. Vassilieff has some satirical comments on that head—has given to the world many valuable works on Chinese subjects from the learned pens of Father Hyacinth (Bicherin), the Archimandrite Palladius, Bretschneider, Gorski and others.

A note attached subsequently to the Protocol regarding the frontier west of the Kiakhta relates how certain hunters testified formally, at Selinghinsk, on the 2/13 of February 1728, to 'the joyful fact' that by this instrument Russia had gained a strip of land eight days' ride in length and three in breadth never before belonging to her, from the river Khan Tenghiri (91° E.) to the Abakan (88° E.—roughly 150 miles); 'for 'when, formerly, either Russians or natives tributary to 'Russia entered that territory as trappers and hunters they 'were beaten and robbed, those places being the very best for 'furs of all kinds, such as sables, foxes, squirrels, gluttons, 'otters and beavers.'

A noteworthy event in 1733 was the despatch of a Chinese embassy to St. Petersburg—the only embassy, as Morse says, sent to a foreign Court by the Manchu dynasty until the reign of Tung-chih (1861–74).

It may be mentioned in passing that the maps of the Russo-Chinese frontier regions up to D'Anville's of 1732—a vast improvement embodying, as they do, the results of the Jesuit

labours—were extraordinarily faulty. Even Witsen's 1704 map, inserted in Isles' travels, is very bad; while a somewhat earlier version of the same map places Niptchu (Nerchinsk) at longitude 150° E. instead of 116° E., a difference of over 1500 miles, and there can be no mistake as to the place meant, for it bears the label 'ad hanc urbem R.P. Gerbillon Jesuita Gallus missus 'fuit ab Imperatore Sinarium Pacem cum Moscovitis tractandi 'causa a^no^ 1689.' Cambaluc (Peking), on many of these old maps is put far to the north of the Amoor! it being still disputed, even after Ricci's arrival in Peking (A.D. 1601), that Northern China was, in truth, the Cathay of Marco Polo.

Trouble still arising in regard to the arrest and extradition of refugees and as to brigandage on the frontier, Catherine II. in 1767 sent an emissary, Kropotoff, to arrange matters, who the following year signed a supplementary treaty at Kiakhta, replacing entirely Art. X. of the treaty of 1727. Professor Vassilieff gives us a Russian translation of the Manchu answers to Russian demands or requests on this occasion. They are drawn up in most contemptuous language, conceding no points of any value and refusing point-blank nearly all, while wringing from the Russian plenipotentiary consent to demolish all the buildings erected on the advance hills near Kiakhta, commanding the frontier, and to retire to the ridge; as likewise not to levy any duties in either Kiakhta or Tsurukhaitu (on the Argoun). The alterations in Art. X. provide for the execution of robbers, etc., on the frontier. This was also in favour of China, as the transgressors were mostly Russian subjects.

In 1792 a frontier agreement was signed by Ludwig Nagel, Governor of Irkutsk at Kiakhta, the Chinese Emperor having sent orders to allow the resumption of trade, 'whereupon,' says the Chinese commissioner (and poet) with fine contempt 'all 'the barbarians jumped for joy. Hearing the order they 'galloped up in post-carts.' The chief point of this agreement rescinded the clause of 1768 stipulating the execution of frontier transgressors, Catherine having abolished meanwhile the death penalty throughout her dominions. But the whole tone was a fresh humiliation for Russia.

The next Russian Embassy was that of Golovkin in 1805; but, having refused to *kowtow* at Urga before a screen and a yellow-covered table representing the Emperor, the Ambassador with all his brilliant suite was ignominiously dismissed and straightway returned to Russia. It was not until 1851 that another treaty was signed, and this a purely commercial agreement by which the Russians obtained the right to visit and trade, under rigid restrictions, at Ili (Kuldja) and Tarbagatai

(Chuguchak). But a momentous time was at hand. The Crimean war, as already said, gave Muravieff the opportunity he had long been waiting for to fly the Russian flag once more on the Amoor. His excuse, a valid one, was the necessity of provisioning and otherwise relieving the Russian Pacific Squadron, blockaded by the Allies in Far Eastern waters. When, four years later, those same Allies, France and England, had China by the throat—she being already exhausted by six years of the Taiping rebellion—Muravieff by a master-stroke recovered for Russia the whole left bank of the Amoor as far as opposite the Ussuri, the treaty to that effect being signed at Aigun on the 16/28 of May 1858. This, the shortest and most important of all the Russo-Chinese treaties, further stipulates that the Manchus dwelling to the number of several thousands on the N. bank of the Amoor, opposite Aigun, should remain there in perpetuity under Chinese sovereignty. It has been stated quite recently that they are still there; but they fled at the time of the Blagovieshchensk massacre in 1900, after which their houses were burnt and their lands confiscated, the latter to be formally handed over to the Cossacks, later on, by the Russian Government. The only other article in the Aigun Treaty gave the right of free trade to the riverain inhabitants on both sides. In June of the same year Admiral Putiatin, who was refused entry from Kiakhta and had to go down the Amoor and roam about the eastern seas until the Allies broke a way for him to Tientsin, in ignorance of the Aigun Treaty signed the Russian Treaty of Tientsin (on the 1/13 of June 1858), a treaty of 'Peace, friendship, commerce 'and navigation,' the first between Russia and China concluded by an envoy arriving by sea, and appropriately enough the first to deal with maritime ports and sea-borne trade. It stipulated for Russia most of the advantages already obtained by western European nations, and Article XII. ensured 'most-'favoured-nation treatment' in future. Two and a half years later Ignatieff, taking advantage of the straits to which China was reduced by the renewed war with England and France, signed the treaty (2/14 of November 1860) by which the whole lower Amoor and the Maritime Province, practically to the present boundary, was ceded to Russia—the territory, that is, left over in 1689 and 1727 'for future delimitation.' A commission was to be appointed to delimitate the western frontier from Shabina Dabag to the border of Kokand; free trade was stipulated along the whole northern and eastern frontier as now established (from the confluence of the Shilka and Argoun to the sea); the Russians might have a consul in

Urga, and trade there and at Kalgan; Russian merchants were authorised to pass freely in China in any less number than 200, buying and selling as they chose; trade was opened provisionally at Kashgar on the same basis as at Ili and Tarbagatai; and, generally, in all places opened to trade the same was to be mutual and unrestricted. This treaty is known as the 'Additional Treaty of Peking.' It was supplemented in 1862 by a Convention for the land-trade between Russia and China, but this was superseded by a somewhat more extended Convention in 1869. This Convention contained the important proviso that Russian merchants should be allowed to trade in Mongolia free of duty and without impediment; but many other articles, prohibiting the sale *en route* of goods of various categories and provenance, seem to contradict that proviso, and were calculated, in any case, to lead to perpetual disputes.

It will be noticed that Muravieff, Putiatin and Ignatieff gained their points thanks mainly to the action of England and France, just as the Caucasus was saved to Russia in 1840 by English and French action on the Syrian coast. Of a truth much history is made unintentionally!

We now come to the treaty of 1881, the Treaty of St. Petersburg, negotiated and signed by Marquis Tseng in place of the repudiated treaty signed by Chung-how at Livadia in Oct., 1879, by which he gave away an important part of the province of Ili or Kuldja, held by Russia since 1871 in consequence of the Mussulman rebellion and temporary eclipse of Chinese influence and power in this region. The boundary agreed to by Chung-how ran from the confluence of the rivers Horgos and Ili in a direction south by east, giving to Russia the Mazar Pass by which the road from Kuldja to Kashgar crosses the Tian-Shan. The new line, after following the Horgos to its junction with the Ili, ran about S.W. to Kuldja, whence to the Tian-Shan the old frontier remained unaltered. By this Treaty of St. Petersburg, in short, Ili was restored to China with the exception of a western strip retained for the benefit of those of the Dungans who should elect to become Russian subjects. China agreed to pay nine million metallic roubles by way of indemnity for expenses of military occupation and losses of Russian subjects. By Article X. the existing right to nominate Russian consuls to Ili, Tarbagatai, Kashgar and Urga was extended to the towns of Kobdo, Uliasutai, Khami, Urumtsi, and Guchen *in conformity with the developement of commerce, and after an understanding with the Chinese Government.* It will be seen that here again was ample room for dispute such as has since arisen.

Another of the points in question derives from Article XI. 'All affairs which may arise on Chinese territory, on the subject 'of commercial or other transactions between those under the 'jurisdictions of the two States, will be examined and regulated, 'by agreement, by the Consuls and the Chinese authorities.' And Article XII. says :

'Russian subjects are authorised to carry on, as in the past, trade free of duties in Mongolia subject to China, as well in places and *aimaks* where there is a Chinese administration as in those where there is none. Russian subjects will equally enjoy the right of carrying on trade free of duties in the towns and other localities of the provinces of Ili, of Tarbagatai, of Kashgar, of Urumtsi, and others situated on the slopes north and south of the chain of the Tian-shan as far as the Great Wall. This immunity will be abrogated when the development of the trade necessitates the establishment of a customs tariff, conformably to an understanding to be come to by the two Governments. Russian subjects can import into the above-named provinces of China and export from them every description of produce, *of whatever origin* they may be.'

Here again is ample room for contention. Indeed, the treaty, to which Russia only consented because the Tekke war occupied her attention in Central Asia and the Amoor lay dangerously open to Chinese attack,* seems framed expressly so as to leave room for future quarrels. There are many other provisos, and to the treaty itself were annexed Regulations (not given by Mayers, who, however, was personally responsible for the 1st ed. only (1877) of the book usually quoted under his name) in seventeen articles, for the land trade, superseding in part those of 1869. The first of these stipulates for trade free of duty between Russian and Chinese subjects in a frontier zone extending fifty versts (100 li) on either side, and this, too, has given rise to serious contention, the Chinese maintaining that the fifty-verst limit applies to the origin of the goods dealt in as well as to the dealing in them—their object being to exclude from the operation of this clause Manchurian flour on which the Amoor mainly depends.

It was frequently stated during the discussion of last spring that this treaty was for a term of ten years, to be automatically renewed for a similar term if not denounced six months before

* 'The Pekin Government had advanced to the Russian frontier in Pri-amoorie considerable armed forces with which our local troops could not possibly hope to deal successfully. It became necessary to despatch with the utmost haste to the Pacific Admiral Lesovsky's powerful squadron.' Pri-amoorie, Moscow, 1909, p. 115.

the expiry of the original ten years term. But this proviso applies, expressly, not to the treaty as a whole, for which no term is given, but to 'the commercial stipulations of the present 'Treaty as well as the Regulations which serve as a supplement 'to it.'

The so-called Cassini Convention, or Secret Treaty of 1895, has never yet been acknowledged. One of its stipulations was that Russia should alone have the right to build the Tsitsikar-Aigun Railway, the proposed construction of which by America made Russia so angry last year, when American negotiators, pursuing purely commercial ends and ignoring (*more* Schuster) delicate questions of international comity, nearly set Russia and the United States by the ears, a well-known publicist, in a paper published in the Philippines, actually proffering Russia's very natural veto as a *casus belli*!

The Port Arthur and Talienwan agreement of 1898 has lapsed by force of circumstances. The only other instruments of importance—signed between Russia and China—are the railway agreement of 1896, and the agreement for the evacuation of Manchuria in 1902; and, of course, Russia joined the other Powers in the Protocol of 1901.

Reverting now to our original contention, we need only show, to complete the picture of Russo-Chinese 'friendship' from the earliest times, that, from the date of the Aigun Treaty onwards, there was continual trouble between the Russian and Chinese authorities on the Amoor itself, and within the three Manchurian provinces.

Probably not one year passed without Russian travellers, in nearly all cases officers or officials, making thinly disguised journeys of reconnaissance in all directions south of the Amoor, to the alarm and anger of the Chinese. These journeys, accounts of which were printed but not published by the Russian General Staff, were avowedly undertaken in view of a war that always seemed probable, and sometimes imminent; and if through the information obtained Russia's position was rendered less precarious, on the other hand the exasperation caused in China brought the danger of war appreciably nearer.

The Aigun Treaty was signed by a prince of the blood, then Governor of Kirin Province, and Sir Thomas Wade stated, at a meeting of the Royal Geographical Society in 1887, that the Emperor, though powerless at the time, by no means surrendered the country with indifference; on the contrary, while he did not punish his cousin, he exposed the second in command for two months in a wooden collar on the banks of the Amoor.

Ignatieff's treaty was, of course, an equally bitter pill for China to swallow. Then, in 1863, we have evidence of Chinese hostility in the account of Malievich's journey; in 1864, in that of Prince Krapotkin; and so it goes on. From 1871 Russia was in occupation, temporarily, of yet more Chinese territory—Kuldja. The endeavour to convert this occupation, as to part of the country, into a permanency nearly led to war in 1880, and though Russia eventually gave way and Tseng's treaty replaced that of Chung How, it cannot be said that the troubles ceased. On the contrary, the provisions of the 1881 Treaty gave rise, as they were bound to, to fresh bickerings and complications, threatening war again already in 1883, and, after various ups and downs, culminating in the Russian Ultimatum of the present year.

Let us now turn to that branch of the question which may prove to be of importance in inverse ratio to the amount of attention hitherto bestowed upon it. In mentioning the voluntary transfer of a Mongol clan to Russia, we hinted at a vast possibility. Even since those words were written, that possibility has emerged into the full light of day. On the 6th of December the 'Novoe Vremya' published telegraphic news to the effect that the Manchu Amban of Urga with his underlings had been turned out and the independence of North Mongolia proclaimed under the rule of the Khutukhta; upon which this leading organ of Russian opinion commented as follows:

'The Mongols have long been aiming at independence. Of late years they have had a bitter time, bearing patiently the full incubus of Chinese misrule. The affair with the Dalai Lama was the last drop that caused the cup to overflow. He enjoys in Mongolia enormous prestige, and Chinese machinations against him have excited indignation throughout the country. As all know, he fled to India, but during his absence he has kept up communication with his faithful adherents, and only waited the favourable moment to come back.

'Our Foreign Office has now received news of the return forthwith of the head of the Tibetan Lamas to Lhassa, and at the same time the telegraph informs us that Mongolia has declared its independence. . . . The Chinese Government has been wholly occupied in the endeavour to put down the rebellion; meantime, outlying parts of the Empire have been left to their own devices, and in Mongolia the local princes, having combined, constitute a force which China is, apparently, powerless to overcome. It is a fact to be noted, that they rally round the person of the Khutukhta, the representative of the Dalai Lama, who, when he reassumes sovereignty in Tibet,

will exert immense influence also in Mongolia. Russia has in him a true and convinced adherent. He more than once proved his devotion to us in the past, and his aim has always been to find a way towards the closest possible relations with us. The Mongol deputation, lately in St. Petersburg, assured our ruling circles that the Mongols sincerely desired the protection of Russia, and that only on obtaining it would the country settle down peaceably, and be able to foster its commercial interests.'

In another column, on the same day, the 'Novoe Vremya' said:

'The tie between Mongolia and the Manchu dynasty is ruptured. It never was strong. The Mongols differ from the Manchus and the Chinese in language, manners and customs, way of life and religion. They were held to China by purely external bonds—subjection in common to the Manchu yoke'; and goes on to point out that 'the revolutionary movement in China started on purely political lines, but national feelings have since developed, and the Mongol movement for independence is merely the natural corollary of the Chinese rebellion against the Manchu dynasty—they must stand or fall together. Russia does not intervene in China's internal troubles, but she cannot kick against the pricks, and together with the other Powers she must recognise accomplished facts. She ought to make up her mind without hesitation, and recognise Mongolia as an independent state.'

It is quite natural, even if not true, that the expelled Amban of Urga should, according to a Peking telegram ('Novoe Vremya' the 17th of December) attribute his discomfiture to Russian machinations. He is said to have accused Russia of distributing arms to the Mongols, and inciting them to revolt, and also of having cut the telegraph line between Urga and the capital; and further light is thrown on the course of events in Mongolia by a circular sent out by the same Amban on the 6th of September last to the Mongol princes on hearing that they had appealed to Russia, complaining of their unhappy lot under Chinese rule. This Amban, be it noted, has under him the whole of Khalka, consisting of two *aimaks* divided into forty-three principalities, and likewise the administrative division of Shabin (i.e. the people to the number of c. 100,000 given by the various princes to the Urga Lama as personal subjects or servants).

The Amban first gives the contents of a telegram from the War Minister, according to which the Russian Ambassador in Peking had made 'friendly' representations, saying that China had repeatedly given assurances of her desire to strengthen good relations with Russia, but various measures had recently been taken in Mongolia, such as the introduction of

Chinese colonists, the modernisation of the army, and changes in the administration upon which the Mongols looked with much fear and suspicion, so that the princes and rulers near the Russian frontier of Khalka as well as the Urga Lamas kept, one after the other, sending special messengers to the Russian Foreign Office to complain of their hard lot. Now as Russians and Mongols were neighbours they must necessarily share their joys and sorrows, for which reason Russia could not look with indifference on what was passing. The best thing would be for affairs on the frontier to be settled by previous agreement. Meantime the Mongols, not understanding the position, might bring about serious complications; for which reason Russia would request the Chinese Government to explain the meaning of the decisions taken as to Mongol affairs and do away with the suspicions that had arisen.

The Amban was instructed to examine into the position of affairs, but to behave with the utmost circumspection. What he did was to explain to those under him that all the incriminated measures were taken solely in the interests of the central Government and for the benefit of the Mongols. Evidently, however, some evilly disposed persons had set about false rumours with the object of promoting the designs of foreigners and leading people astray. Such being the case it was almost inevitable that trouble should result, wherefore diligent enquiry must be made to find out who had sent the messengers bearing complaints to Russia—it is not said whether with a view to their reward or punishment, though we may make a shrewd guess at what was intended.

The circular goes on to upbraid the princes for their ingratitude, ignorance and insincerity, but not a word is said as to the real reasons for complaint, i.e. the quartering of Chinese troops in Khalka; the arming of local Chinese; the distribution of the best Mongol lands to Chinese colonists; the proposal to deprive the princes of their autonomous rights; the introduction of Chinese local administration; reduction in number of Buddhist monasteries and inscription of the younger lamas in the ranks of the army—a long list of measures calculated as a whole (says the 'Novoe Vremya') to rob the Mongols of their national and religious privileges. Yet some of these very measures were suggested many years ago by a very competent observer, Colonel Barabash, as necessary reforms in Mongolia!

In the course of a highly interesting description of the Mongols Barabash notes that it was their perpetual dissensions that

led to their becoming tributary to China under Kang-hi (A.D. 1691), when that wise monarch, profiting by the past experience of his subjects, the Chinese, adopted towards the Mongols a policy calculated, while keeping them as useful auxiliaries, to prevent them ever again achieving independence. Nor was this difficult: he had merely to give a legal sanction to the existing system of appanages, thus ensuring the division of both land and people amongst a host of petty princes and chieftains. These princes were all salaried on a fixed scale according to their importance. They were all obliged to visit Peking and perform the *kowtow* at least once in three years, and encouraged to do so more often, their stay in the capital being rendered agreeable by the grant of free board and lodging, the rendering of various honours and dignities, besides more substantial gifts. They were allowed to select their successors from among their sons, who, however, on attaining their majority must come to Peking for investiture by the Emperor. Many of them were given wives of the imperial blood, and these princes were granted extra salaries in money and in kind, as were their wives. Finally, they retained the privilege of giving away their subjects to each other and to the chief lamas, though not to foreigners.

The Central Government took no taxes, but the princes had the right to exact certain dues at a fixed rate and others that, unfortunately, were not limited in amount. These latter lay as a heavy burden on the people, and together with the hard dealing of the Chinese traders, on whom the Mongols were dependent for tea, cotton goods, and all necessaries save the products of their flocks and herds, went far towards reducing them to beggary. Their ruin was completed by Lamaism, which put upon them the further burden of maintaining in idleness a vast number of celibates, some say one-fifth of the whole male population, some even more. As to local matters, the power of the princes was pretty complete, but the whole adult male population was divided by the Manchus for purposes of control (being, practically, unarmed) into regiments having as units squadrons of 150 men each, the whole being under the supervision of two commanders-in-chief, at Uliasutai and Khukhu Hoton, and under them ambans at Urga, Ulusutai and Kobdo. The commanders-in-chief were under the Mongol office in Peking, the head of which reported in person to the Emperor.

The Mongols were a moral, religious people, their chief faults being extreme dirtiness and a laziness involving a dislike, natural enough, for agriculture. As a consequence, such land—

and there is more of it than might be supposed—as is fit for cultivation lay idle, the Central Government jealously prohibiting Chinese emigration to Mongolia.

What then is the present state of things west and north of the Great Wall? Encouraged by Chinese example to throw off the Manchu yoke, the only yoke they have ever known, the Mongols have quite logically declared themselves independent. They may eventually elect to be governed by a secular ruler, but meantime have rallied round the Urga Lama (the Khutukhta), who looks to the Dalai Lama as his chief. Being nomads and, in the modern sense, unarmed, they are from a military point of view too weak to stand alone ; they turn, therefore, to Russia for protection against their former masters the Manchus, and, perhaps, against the Chinese themselves. And the question arises, what will Russia do ?

There is now in St. Petersburg, as special Envoy and Minister Plenipotentiary, his Excellency Lou Tseng Tsiang, entrusted by the Peking Government with the negotiations for the revision of the 1881 treaty. These negotiations were begun some two to three months ago, and are said to be pursuing a normal course. It is evident, however, that the crisis in China may affect them seriously, and must in any case delay them. Meantime it is worth noting that Russia's attention is, or was a short time since, concentrated mainly on the furtherance of her trade interests in Mongolia and Sin-Tsan. The 'Novoe Vremya,' after pointing out that new factors exist in China, since the treaty was originally framed, namely Japan, as a continental power, and the United States (an aggressive rival), affirms categorically 'whatever programme 'our representatives may be guided by, whatever demands 'they may address to China, they must first and foremost 'settle the question of our trade in China without the Wall.' This trade, in spite of favouring circumstances, has diminished since the eighties to one-fourth of what it was, the Mongolian import and export amounting now to no more than four and twelve million roubles respectively—the falling off being largely, it is admitted, due to want of energy and enterprise amongst the Russian merchants. There are other reasons however. The right of free trade stipulated in the treaty is, we are told, rendered null in practice by Chinese evasion, and the significant admission is made that it is more important to settle the trade on a satisfactory basis than to insist on a freedom from taxation which experience shows it is impossible to enforce. Russia

is now a great manufacturing country, and she can look only to Central Asia, in the large sense, for expansion of her foreign sales; for in China proper, now that the door is open and likely to be kept so, she can hardly hope to compete with other Powers, wherefore *the Mongolian market must be secured at all hazards*!

To this end the first and most important material means would be the projected railway from Muissovaya, on Lake Baikal, to Kaikhta. The construction of this line is being urgently called for by the Russian press and is to be discussed shortly by the Council of Ministers. The Railway Commission recently reported that it would from the first year easily pay interest on the capital outlay, and it is confidently predicted that, as a feeder to the great Siberian Line, it would soon prove of vast importance. Its extension to Urga (180 miles), and thence to Kalgan—already connected by rail with Peking, —would follow sooner or later as a matter of course, this line having already been put forward by Russia as an alternative to the objectionable Aigan-Tsitsikar-Peking proposal—objectionable, that is, until at least the Amoor Railway is completed.

At such a moment as this it is, of course, impossible to predict with any confidence the ultimate outcome of the situation thus created by the Russo-Chinese dispute plus the revolutionary movement in China, but it seems likely at least that Russia will have her own way in Mongolia; that she will seek to confirm her political prestige there for the benefit of her trade and manufactures; and that she will profit by Lamaist goodwill, carefully fostered for some years past, to exercise henceforth a preponderating influence at Urga and at Lhassa—with what further extensions who shall say?

Art. X.—SCOTTISH SONGSTRESSES.

1. *Songs and Verses.* By Lady John Scott. Edited, with a Memoir, by her Grandniece, Margaret Warrender. Edinburgh: David Douglas. 1911.

2. *The Spindle-Side of Scottish Song.* By Jessie P. Findlay. London: J. M. Dent and Co. 1902.

Miss Warrender has done a good work in giving her excellent little memoir to the world. We had however already made our acquaintance with the poems of Lady John Scott in her 'Thirty Songs,' and question whether the new and complete edition has added in the smallest degree to her reputation. Miss Warrender writes with personal knowledge, and infuses into the pages of her memoir the glow and warmth of personal affection; but we are inclined to assert that many of the verses now printed for the first time have little poetical merit and we could well spare them. Lady John's reputation has been made by one or two songs of purest lyrical quality. By them alone she will be remembered and entitled to claim her place alongside the foremost of the Scottish lyrists, whose notes have echoed sweetly amid the barren wastes and howling desolations of Scottish vernacular literature.

Lady John Scott is the last representative of a line of Scottish ladies who base their claims to immortality on one or two songs, who wrote spontaneously and freely, independent of critical rules and regulations, and in the doing of it shrouded themselves in a veil of mysterious and regrettable anonymity. The amount of her work is small, and, while indubitably in direct line of succession, the close reader can remark a clear divergence from the manner and style of her predecessors. Occasionally the homely Scots fails her, and she has recourse to the Southern speech. This, in itself, is symptomatic, for if it be objected that Sir Robert Ayton wrote in English and that Mr. Thomas Sheridan, in the year 1761, delivered twelve lectures in St. Paul's Episcopal Chapel on the pure English pronunciation in a rich Irish brogue, and Edinburgh society fell to mincing and chopping its words to the vast amusement of the Southrons, and that Robert Burns adopted a similar method, we must remember that in these instances English was the non-national language and Scots spoken in castle and cottage alike. Was Lady John Scott, we wonder, in the habit of talking Scotch in the intimate circle of her friends? It was a

language early acquired, but to her non-natural, and now the dialects have fallen into the hands of the philologists. To 'haud fast by the past' was with her a conscious effort, for the same speech is no longer heard in castle and cottage. Lady John is the last of our native-born singers, who, detesting elaborate psychological analysis and metrical mystifications, sings the elemental emotions in the old speech set to the quaint old melodies of the countryside—the genuine artist 'qui gardait en face du monde une certaine nouveauté de cœur et une éternelle fraîcheur de sensation.'* Directness and simplicity are the dominant characteristics of her work, but we miss the democratic note of her predecessors. In the work of Lady John's predecessors difference of class was non-existent; with her the case is different. She is the least democratic of her line; her verses are the swan song of Scottish poetry.

On the 1st of August 1898 Lord Napier and Ettrick, a few weeks before his death, despatched a letter from Thirlestane to Lady John Scott. He set enormous store by that friendship, which had lasted over sixty-six years. In his letter Lord Napier made direct and apologetic allusion to a certain late freedom he had taken with Lady John's name. The freedom referred to was nothing more nor less than an appreciative and commendatory reference to the poetical talents of the latest of our songstresses.† Lady John had an unconquerable aversion to publicity, but, like Lady Nairne, had not Sir Walter's 'art 'of denying,' and was unfeignedly pleased when anyone praised one of her songs. Few of these were printed during her lifetime and at her death the majority were still in the original manuscript. The occasion alluded to above was not her first public appearance. 'Annie Laurie,' based on an earlier version given in 'Songs of Scotland,' edited by Allan Cunningham,‡ was composed in 1835 at Marchmont while on a visit to her sister, Lady Hume Campbell, and printed anonymously three years later, without either her knowledge or consent. It was not until 1854 that her authorship was made public, in which year the song was published by Lonsdale as one of a series of six for the benefit of the wives and families of the soldiers ordered to the Crimea.

Lady John's choice of anonymity resulted from no personal idiosyncrasy. It was a tradition with this line of Scottish ladies to veil their authorship. Their songs were an incident in their lives—the lyrical expression of a passing mood of

---

* M. Guyau.

† Edinburgh Review, April 1898. ‡ 1825.

passion. There is no poetical developement to be recorded; family histories we have, lives of Baillies and Humes and Lindsays and Elliots—records of grand old Scottish families containing vague and unimportant reference to world-famous songs, belated confessions of authorship, feuds and marriages and deaths and hopes unfulfilled, but no record of struggles with contemporary taste, no quarrels with blind and venomous critics,* no madnesses, no despairs. The story of one song is the story of all; they came into the world neither with blare of trumpet nor amid national thanksgiving: children whose parents were unkent, and when men first took note of them they wore rough homespuns and prattled the broad Northern speech and were simple and artless. These were the songs which had been sung for generations, on bleak hillside and in scattered hamlet, at rockings and ewe-buchtings and funerals; songs learned from glib-tongued minstrels with rough voices and tattered wallet, jogging on Heaven knows whither, here a night, there a night, and paying their lawing with a song. With what mournful reluctance did the Scottish muse pack her up and hie her across Berwick Bridge in the train of the Sixth James Stuart! How bitter her experience, for the ascetic black-browed Reformers in her own country had decreed her art profane and unprofitable, and the Southrons flouted her and scorned her homely accents and jeered at her homely garb. The very friends she had taught, turned their backs, ashamed of her company, with the exception of a bare half-dozen who stuck to her heartfully and made songs timidly after their own manner; and in time she grew wholly silent in that gay company. Then one day she slipped away from Court and took the North road again, and crossed the Borders and set up school once more and taught a certain 'black-avised' little button of a man how little he needed to be ashamed of her music after all; and her pupils came flocking about her and her singing was better than ever. Some she taught but the one song, to others she dealt in more liberal measure. And now she is old and grey and can no longer find pupils so easily, and her reputation is lessened somewhat; but men had been telling each other for years that her work was finished and that she was dead and forgotten. The songs she taught were naïve and simple and destitute of artistry, oblivious of dailies and quarterlies and monthlies, modelled on the old, fashioned in

* Unless we except the case of 'Auld Robin Gray,' 'a ballad fortunate in the admiration of the world and the abuse of Pinkerton.'

the atmosphere of the old, and finding their public among rude and uncultured folk. The writers of those songs laid no claim to kinship with their literary contemporaries across the Border. To reveal the secret of their authorship was to risk ecclesiastical thunders, censure from the critics, gibes from the antiquarians and scorn from the literary dictators. A million times rather remain obscure and mysterious, and enjoy the triumph if such might be recorded.

Without her lyrical poetry the literature of Scotland would be a poor and barren and narrow and unkindly thing. Scottish song is full of the rich wisdom of experience hardly won. They were strong men who sang those songs with armour clanking; men fierce-eyed and savage and tender, who knew not where they might rest their heads when the sun went down. What bloody scenes did those early balladists witness; how deeply dyed their hands, how black their consciences, how fierce their eyes, how bold their speech, how timid their mood when the wandering fire flitted in the sedge and the whaup screamed above the mangled corpse they had left stark and stiff on the hill; how piously they murmured their shivering Aves! How jealously the Reforming Kirk eyed those profane ones who were given to the turning of verses and the humming of godless tunes and the making of melody in their hearts! What a blackguardly fellow that Wilson—servant to the Bishop of Dunkeld—who knew neither his New Testament nor his Old over well, who made a despiteful railing ballad against the preachers, and narrowly escaped a hanging for his pains! These old Scottish song-writers are, in a sense, all anonymous; they have no thought of revealing their personality or creating an intellectual atmosphere of their own or forming an aesthetic coterie or discovering emotional kinship. They are merely the fortuitous spokesmen, the casual and ingenious interpreters of a peculiar phase in the national experience. Scotland has been fertile in the native wild flowers of lyrical genius, but her poets have remained in utter ignorance of the claims of poetry as an art. Almost four hundred years before Christ Simylus, of the Middle Comedy, had enunciated, that for lasting literary achievement neither nature without art nor art unassociated with nature was sufficient, that nature, will, pains and method make poets good and wise—and without these they add to themselves nothing but the burden of the years. While her ballad-makers have drawn on the vast mass of legendary material and the traditional tales of the countryside, no poet has arisen who has fused it together and assimilated it and recast it and produced a work of epic proportions. Now

we rarely venture to sing our old songs ourselves, but hand them over to others who profess to be their interpreters. A generation ago a patriotic Scot * mourned over the decay of the poetry of the country and the blind and barbarous perverseness of her verse-makers. 'Neither in the magnificent harmonies of the 'oratorio nor in the solemn soothings of the cathedral chant 'is there any place found for the native national and patriotic 'element so strongly pronounced in the national drama or 'opera of the Greeks.' The stream has narrowed to a rivulet painfully trickling down its barren channel, and the course of native genius is shamelessly diverted. The Scottish reserve of character has militated against the fuller expansion of its poetry. When censure is inevitable, when austerity and bigotry prevail, when a true standard of taste is absent, when there is encouragement neither to produce nor publish, the effect on poetry is disastrous. The literature of Scotland followed a strange and devious course, amid constant warring with neighbours, internecine strife, persecutions, and burnings and abolishing of old religions and establishing of new, and Puritanic austerity and bigotry and ecclesiastical tyranny and narrowness and ignorance. How vastly different had been the histories of English and Scottish literature in the seventeenth century; how dissimilar the literary conditions in the two countries in the beginning of the eighteenth century, when Lady Wardlaw and Lady Grizel Baillie and Hamilton of Gilbertfield and Allan Ramsay were writing their ballads and rhyming epistles, and Scotland was once more becoming conscious of her scandalous remissness in the matter of her folk-song!

At the moment when Lady Wardlaw of Pitreavie was setting one of the most baffling literary problems of the century, Scotland could boast of no Lady Mary Montagu versed in Greek philosophy to write her letters from the East and be foully lampooned by Pope; nor a Hester Chapone, to write on the Improvement of the Mind; nor an Addison, a Steele, a Swift, or a Congreve. Excellent, no doubt, were the sallies of wit at the Musical Club in the 'Cross Keys' when Archibald Pitcairne, warmed up with claret, would pull out his latest Latin effusion and read it for the edification of the company and growl at the stupid Presbyterians or discuss longs and shorts with Sir William Scott of Thirlestane, who wrote Latin pieces, and Dr. Patrick Abercrombie and Sir William Bennet and David Gregory—excellent Latinists all—as they straggled

* Blackie, 'Scottish Song,' p. 3.

down Niddry's Close and up the High Street cumbered with all manner of abominations at tuck of the ten o'clock drum. But these were mere echoes of the South.

The revival of popular poetry is peculiarly associated with the name of Bishop Percy. The influence of the 'Reliques' was more literary than popular, and in England confined directly within a narrow circle.

'Their best service was to show that the past is still alive in the present; and that the theme which is on every lip, the melody which rings in every ear, only awaits the touch of genius to become that which has the double charm of immemorial antiquity and of absolutely spontaneous individuality. Burns is the supreme instance of all that might be drawn from the fountain of popular poetry first unsealed by Percy. The fascination of the themes and utterance of the countryside, the sense that a poet most sing in the speech of his birth, in the language which comes charged for himself and others with memories of the home and of the vanished past, the charm of the savour of the soil—all these things were implicit in the labours of Percy, and all came to the surface in the poetry of Burns.'*

But long before Cowper lamented the barbarism of the Scottish bard, the secret had been re-discovered, and James Watson and Allan Ramsay had given the first signal for the Romantic Revival in the North.

During the second half of the seventeenth century poetry in Scotland had reached its nadir. When Montrose and Stirling and Drummond of Hawthornden laid by their pens great darkness and howling desolation fell on the land. Men had little time to spare for the cultivation of such an effeminate art as poetry in those practical days, when there were more hard knocks given and women's tears and hand-wringing than humming of tunes. Gloom and mirk settled over the land, with rarely glimmering lights, will o' the wisps in the hill sides . . . the ancient Scottish Muse stumbling brokenly with smouldering cruisie. Nor did the darkness lift until the commissioners had met in their cellar off the High Street and appended their signatures with trembling fingers to the Articles of Union, and Chancellor Seafield stepped down stiffly from his chair and ended the 'auld sang' on the 10th of January. And so it came about that up till the early part of the eighteenth century poetry lived a very vagrant and disreputable life in Scotland,† lilts hummed at 'ewe-buchtings,' when lads were daffin

* Vaughan, 'The Romantic Revolt,' p. 29.

† 'Scottish Songs,' Chambers, p. 1.

and gabbin and maids lifted their leglins and hied them away. National pasquils abounded and songs composed on Wallace according to Fordun, rhymes made in derision of the Englishmen after Bannockburn, which were after many days sung by the maidens and minstrels of Scotland in 'dances and 'carols' to the reproof and mockery of their hereditary and vanquished foes, with '*heve a lowe and rumblylowe*' and divers others, which the worthy Fabyan will overpass—truffes and rounds curiously preserved by the English. Nor will Barbour rehearse the manner of the memorable tussle in which Sir John de Soulis, Governor of Eskdale, with a troop of fifty stout fellows, gained a glorious victory over Sir Andrew Hercla with three hundred scoundrelly white-livered Englishmen; for

> 'Quhasae likes thai may her
> Young women when thae play
> Sing it among them ilk day.'

In the 'Complaynt of Scotland' (1549) we stumble on a collection of venerable and cracked and tumble-down headstones, recording neither the virtues nor the vices but the mere names of departed Scottish songs; and the people were weaned from their too popular and profane songs, and won over to godliness and a reasonable frame of mind by the 'Compendius Book of Godly and Spiritual Songs' (1590) which was printed by good Andro Hart for our edification, who doubtless made by the transaction. What a stealthy underground existence popular song led during the century! but we prick up our ears when we hear mention of the 'Wooing of Jock 'and Jenny' (1568), and wonder who the composer could have been and who the first singer; and 'Tak' your auld cloak about 'ye' which Shakespeare knew, for he quotes it in 'Othello' (1611). More scraps we discover toward the latter part of the seventeenth century—and from the titles they were not entirely of the good and godly type—and English songs in a Scotch collection which was popular, and tells us that for the time being at any rate the native style had gone out. It is to the reign of the second Charles that we owe the exquisite 'Waly, Waly'; and somewhere about the year 1682 the London audiences would be charmed with Catherine Ogie, which gave the hint to Tom D'Urfey and his filth-loving Grubstreeters. 'Up in the 'morning early,' possibly the first original Scots air to appear in print, was a favourite with Queen Mary, King William's consort, and by that time it was fashionable to sing Scotch airs, and Tom D'Urfey commenced and dedicated his six volumes

of miserable imitations of the Scotch manner to the highest in the land. Naturally the English fashion spread to Scotland, and the ingenious Allan Ramsay dedicated his 'Tea-Table Miscellany' to 'Ilka lovely British Lass,' and the whole town, pretending they never had seen anything in poetry and music that was elaborate and artificial, commenced singing and laughing and weeping over these songs at their tea-parties, and many of them were of such a nature that had we been there, we would have crimsoned furiously and hid our faces in our saucers at the antics of the high-kilted muse. As early as 1591 the Danish ballads had been collected into a volume, but the first reference to any English collection appears to be 'Dick of the Cow,' mentioned in the list of a London bookseller in 1688.* The first Scottish collection made by James Watson (1706) was printed at Edinburgh,† and was followed by Allan Ramsay's 'Evergreen' and 'Tea-Table Miscellany' (1724).‡ Public interest in the subject was aroused and imitations were at once in the market. The first transgressor was Lady Wardlaw, whose 'Hardyknute' was published by James Watson (1719) in a neat folio edition of twelve pages. This ballad was universally accepted as a genuine antique, a contemporary account of the battle of Largs fought in 1263. Lady Wardlaw was forty when her ballad was published, a woman of elegant accomplishments and great sweetness of temper, who wrote other poems and practised drawing and cutting paper with scissors. She was the first of the line of amiable songstresses who have done so much to preserve and invigorate Scottish poetry.

Nothing is more remarkable than the succession of essentially democratic songs which we have from the pens of these aristocratic ladies. The old Scots gentry were bound up with the people. 'Werena my heart licht I wad dee' was first published by Thomson in his folio 'Orpheus Caledonius' (1725). The authoress was Lady Grisell Baillie, who was born at Redbraes Castle, on the 25th of December 1665. In Constable's 'Edinburgh Magazine' of May 1808, the editor, Mr. Pringle, refers to a fragment of a song supposed to be the composition of Lady Grisell. The fragment was the 'Ewe Buchting,' the words of which were adapted to an air composed by Charles Sharpe of Hoddam when seven years old. Homely, irregular, realistic,

---

* Kæmpe Viser. Cf. Eyre Todd 'Scot. Ballad Poetry,' p. 29.

† The title of Watson's volume was 'Choice Collection of Comic and Serious Scots Poems, both Ancient and Modern.'

‡ Nothing more was done until the publication in 1763 of Percy's 'Reliques.'

her chief song is remembered as much by the refrain as anything else:

'And werena my heart licht I wad dee.'

What endurance, what tender solicitude, she showed in those early days of difficulty and hardship, what shifts and disguises and ludicrous haps we read of, what true and simple loyalty in the daughter of the pinched and exiled 'Dr. Wallace'! I fear me the stern clergy at home would scarcely have approved this excellent gentleman had they known his advice to his family not to pass a week-day without dancing, and his sinful conviction that melancholy was the deadliest enemy of mankind, to be thrown out of window or locked fast in cellar. No repining on her part, no shirking the burden, no profitless lover's sighing for young George Baillie, her brother's friend, the Prince of Orange's big-limbed guardsman. When the Prince came to England and George Baillie's estate was restored, they were married and lived for forty-eight years in trust and confidence, and when he died at Oxford, that black August, this singular original, warm-hearted, gentle-tempered old lady called in all her philosophy to her aid, but gave us no more songs. Lady Grisell died in 1746.

Next appeared 'The Blackbird,' a version of 'The Flowers 'of the Forest.' The authoress, Mrs Cockburn, was an indefatigable letter-writer, but in the whole of her correspondence only one reference occurs to her song. This letter was written to her friend Mr. Douglas, on the 28th of November 1775. 'I 'hate print,' she says, 'and though I have been sung at Wells 'to "The Flowers of the Forest," I never was in print that 'anybody but a street singer could decipher.' Mrs Cockburn came to be identified with her song and constantly pestered for copies of it. It was accepted by the rank and fashion and sung at the Spas—at Moffat and Dunse and St. Ronan's. She was no very strait-laced person, this tactful little lady, and refused to swallow her Calvinism in powerful doses for anyone. She confesses that Mr. Davidson, the excellent minister of Galashiels, was emphatically right when he shook his head over her and told her she was not yet a Christian. What a contagious joy of heart she possessed, what a determined optimism, what an itching in the heels troubled her perpetually, what a dangerous breaker of hearts she was in her youth, what a splendid old lady to gather the wit and fashion of Edinburgh into her rooms when she had passed the fourscore! What an excellent chronicle of old Edinburgh society her letters are, what a variety of interests she had, what a wide circle of friends!

married early, in her eighteenth year, into a family with strong Whig principles, and when only seventeen, the year her brother died, she had several matrimonial as well as dancing lovers. To Mr. Patrick Cockburn, a cadet of the house of Ormiston, who had been called to the Scotch Bar a few years earlier, she gave her heart and hand. She lived, loved and loving, for twenty-two years, and their whole income was at the time 150*l.*, and they never owed a shilling. She had her own adventure in the '45, when riding home in the Ravelston coach, and was stopped at the Port by the Highland guard, with mocking verses on the Prince's Proclamation crinkling in her pocket. She was closely concerned with some of the most remarkable social events of her generation — the Douglas Cause, for example, over which her Grace of Argyll snubbed the unfortunate Boswell so dreadfully at Inverary. She had a rare power of discrimination in the qualities of her friends, and although there was a serious misunderstanding with David Hume, she takes his part against Rousseau, who had accused him of the meanest things, such as opening his friends' letters. When she wrote to David we fear she adopted a style which must have highly gratified that genial philosopher, and David must certainly be admitted to the 'Capillaire' Club, which about that time had nearly a couple of hundred ladies and gentlemen of the first distinction at its annual ball. What a card-playing lot they had become in Edinburgh, and how fond of the playhouse, and lately Mrs. Cockburn had been with her friends to see a very good comedy, 'The School for Wives.' The godly had all gone to England to Whitefield and Wesley, and all who remained were become worshippers of Mammon, and Baron Mure kept sober, but Mrs. Mure drank hard. How prudently she threaded her difficult way between the 'least little 'woman that ever was seen for nothing,' Henrietta Cumming, at Balcarres, who was skilled in mantua-making and ruffles, and the Soph, i.e. Miss Sophia Johnstone, daughter of the Laird of Hilton, who went on a visit to Balcarres on the day of her ladyship's marriage, erected her forge in her bedroom, and stayed for thirteen years. How well Sir Walter remembered her with her rough voice and gigantic stride and coarse manners and her man's coat and square-buckled shoes, and the evening she kicked his sister under the card-table at Mrs. Cockburn's! On a certain Wednesday she gave a ball and packed twenty-two people into her little flat and had nine couples constantly dancing and tables covered with eatables besides, and Captain Bob Dalrymple was king of the ball, and the fiddler sat where the cupboard is, and they danced in both rooms and everyone was vastly

happy. And next day to the Assembly, which she enjoyed more than poor Goldsmith, who skulked in when it was held in the West Bow some time in 1753, clad in 'skyblue sattin, 'rich black genoa velvet, and best superfine clarett-coloured 'cloth.' Poor awkward, blundering, addle-pated Goldsmith, most kindly, most foolish, most irregular of mortals, what in Heaven's name took you to the Assembly of all places? There were seven sets dancing that Thursday when the bright little lady patronised the Assembly—all quality ladies and all handsome. Soph Johnstone danced in the heartsome set. What a struggle those high and mighty dames must have had up those narrow stairs with their hoops, some of them, I have no doubt, five yards in circumference, and their toupees and their patches and their fans, and the gentlemen had brought a couple of oranges in their pocket for their ladies to suck during the intervals, and their snuff-boxes dangled at their waists, while their sedans waited below and the linkmen's torches flared and guttered and the reek crept up the stairs and caught their throats, and the porters spluttered Gaelic oaths, and the watch drowsed in their guardhouse, and the caddies hung about for their employers. We should have loved to have been present had she entertained Boswell's friend, the famous Dr. Johnson, who arrived at the White Horse Inn on the 14th of August 1773. Her friend, Lady Anne Lindsay, made his acquaintance. Mrs. Cockburn died in her house in Crighton Street, 22nd of November 1794, in her eighty-third year.

The romantic account given by Shenstone * of the origin of Miss Rutherford's song must be abandoned. Nor is there any ground for the assumption that the gentleman of her acquaintance is to be identified in her lover, John Aikman. The verses composed on the old mansion-house of Fairnilee contain no reference to the disaster of Flodden. The theme is the fickleness of fortune and the uncertainty of riches, the occasion a financial catastrophe in Ettrick Forest, which brought ruin and insolvency on seven of the lairds. Mrs. Cockburn's version is vastly inferior to that of Miss Elliot; there is less genuine emotion, and a certain pompousness of expression, and the note of condolence, while hardly conventional, is certainly artificial. The genuine old air is associated with Miss Elliot's verses, and while it is immaterial whether her version or that of Mrs. Cockburn can claim priority in the matter of composition, all doubt on the point is set at rest

* Illustrations, p. 65.

if we accept Dr. Somerville's statement that the ballad was composed during the years he acted as tutor at Minto* (1767–72).

Miss Jean Elliot was born at Minto House in 1727. Her father, along with Forbes of Culloden, had shared the expense of publishing 'Hardyknute' in a small folio. Her brother—the third Sir Gilbert, a distinguished scholar and a man of taste—was also a poet. At Minto from time to time were seen David Hume, John Home, Mrs. Montagu, Dr. Gregory, Lord Kames, and others of lesser note. Jean Elliot received a careful education. She had a sensible face and was slight in figure, and according to her miniature wore a close cap and white neckerchief and ruffles; her eyebrows were arched, her eyes thoughtful, her nose and mouth large. It was in 1756, we are asked to believe, that Miss Elliot, driving home after nightfall with her brother Sir Gilbert, in the family coach, fell into talk with him on Flodden. She was then in her twenty-ninth year. Ancient memories crowded in on her thoughts—perhaps someone had quoted with unforgettable passion the refrain of an old ballad at dinner, Melancholy climbed into the carriage and sat by her, and silence fell. Lying back in her seat, with the refrain sighing and crooning in her ears, she put her verses together. The first line, she confided to Sir Walter, was original, and there were others, but she only remembered one:

> 'I ride single in my saddle,
> Since the flowers of the forest are all wede away.'

The lament refers to the destruction wrought in the bounds of the forest by the battle of Flodden. It bears little trace of its century—less than in the case of Mrs. Cockburn's version, where if the 'manners are old' 'the language is but of yesterday.' Immediately it became popular, and was a prime favourite in the flats and drawing-rooms and concerts of Old Edinburgh. Young misses, whose behooped and bepowdered grandames had learnt to handle gambo and virginal and to pace a minuet with becoming solemnity, and whose mothers had listened to sonatas on hautbois and 'cello and gone into raptures on dull afternoons at the 'Cross Keys' when my Lord Haddington sat him down to the harpsichord—young misses who danced reels and strathspeys and shuddered at the bare thought of those old dances, sat them down at their pianofortes and quavered out Miss Jean's version, and the company grew sad and the faces set, until the candles were lit and the tea brought in and the maids came

* Pinkerton published Miss Elliot's version in 1781.

with the pattens and the sedans were announced below—and they went away wondering who the author could be who had moved them so strangely. But Miss Jean gave no sign.

When old Sir Gilbert died she removed with her mother to Edinburgh. She lived in the then fashionable quarter in Brown Square, was quiet and retired and made no figure in society, like Mrs. Cockburn. There was a vast quaintness in the manners of the Old Town of Edinburgh when Charles Townshend visited it in 1759. A 'female porter'—shocking spectacle—without shoes or stockings received him when he visited Lord President Craigie in the Lawnmarket. The gentlemen strutted in gold lace and cocked hat, and old ladies wore 'toys' and young ladies plaids about their heads in church, and young gentlemen presented their ladyloves with snuff-boxes with pretty heartsome devices on the lids, and every cottage contained a copy of Boston's 'Fourfold State,' and people wondered greatly at sight of the cumbrous stage coach which ran between Edinburgh and London every month. What a motley medley simmered in the fashionable High Street, and how well everyone knew everyone else. One had only to apply to the 'caddies' for information on a topic: that curious species of outcast and confidant, detective and cut-purse, who huddled on stair-heads and had a benevolent society and a central fund and a chief who dealt out punishment to erring members of the fraternity. What abominable scandal-mongers! What blackguardly lazzaroni! What amazing intelligencers these ragamuffins were! What a welter of bedesmen and broom-makers and salt-hawkers and fishwives from Musselburgh and blue-coated ministers in three-cornered hats, and judges with their wigs on their heads, and advocates with their gowns over their arms, and fine old ladies with three-inch shoes and cane and patches, and young ladies with green paper fans and velvet masks and flashing eyes, and pompous little russet-clad merchants and legal cranks and sweeps and naturals and the thousand and one types of rascals and 'bodies' the dirty old capital swarmed with.

Miss Elliot kept her own sedan chair, patronised card-parties, where someone was certain to sing 'The Flowers,' and perhaps started mincing her Scotch and aping the English after attending Thomas Sheridan's preposterous lectures. She was exclusive in her friendships. How she would have shuddered at the bare mention of the frolics in Luckie Middlemass's tavern in the Cowgate, whither fine gentlemen would resort with their ladies and regale themselves on raw oysters and porter, an abominable little 'laigh' shop with coarse tables and spluttering candles, where the talk was loud and droll and unfitted for

our polite modern ears. Then they called for more punch and brandy, and had the oyster women in to dance in the ballroom, and it was no disgrace if the ladies became intoxicated in good company. Doubtless our poetess was a good kirk-goer, and sat under Calvinistic Dr. John Erskine, with his brown wig, in the Old Greyfriars, or stiff Dr. Blair of the High, who was on the Minto visiting list, and went with the rest of society to hear the famous George Whitefield, who condescended to a pun even in the middle of his most solemn exhortations, paid her calls dutifully, saw her circle dwindle about her, and was shy of making new friends, and shook her head over the new fashions and the giddiness of the young folk. And when age with stealing steps came on her at the beginning of the new century, and turned her thoughts to the old scenes and the scent of the broom and the dew on the morning grass on the Minto crags, she slipped away quietly and took the South road once more and passed away in her brother's home on the 29th of March, 1805, in her seventy-ninth year.

Mrs. Cockburn had kept the secret of the authorship of 'Auld Robin Gray' admirably. The writer of the song was Lady Anne Lindsay or Barnard, who wrote the poem when only twenty-one and kept her secret for fifty years. She was the eldest daughter of James fifth Earl of Balcarres, a deaf old gentleman who was sixty when he lost his heart to Miss Dalrymple at Moffat and pined away at an alarming rate when that excellent lady refused him. A big man his lordship was, with a big brigadier's wig with three tails and an odd curl or two, and a shoe slashed for his gouty toe, a book-collector and an ardent Jacobite. Lady Anne had eleven brothers and sisters and was eighteen when the old earl died. Balcarres was a noble place but for a remarkable scarcity of the currency. Among the visitors were Mrs. Cockburn and Soph Johnstone, who detested Henrietta Cumming, the governess, an obstinate little woman whom her ladyship had found weeping and painting butterflies in the garret of a house in Edinburgh, who refused to dine with her ladyship's maid and starved herself, until she was allowed to sit at table with the family, as was only fitting for a descendant of the Red Comyn. How eagerly Lady Anne looked forward to her visits to the smoky old capital across the Forth, the playhouse, the tea parties, where she could not fail to have come across Jean Elliot, and the Assembly where she danced in the heartsome set. She lived with the venerable old Lady Dalrymple, mildest and most innocent of beings, with her mitts and her snuffbox, who went through a droll little performance every morning

when she appeared for breakfast, stopping on the seventeenth spot of the carpet, coughing three times, losing her key and finding it on her left hand near her little finger. The strong-minded Dowager Countess of Balcarres, with whom she lived at other times, lodged in the Lawnmarket and wore a black satin bonnet and gown and a white apron and carried a staff in her hand, and everyone made way for her. It was at Balcarres after her sister's marriage, in the little plain closet in the high winding staircase, that Lady Anne set herself to compose a new ballad to the tune of Soph Johnstone's 'The Bridegroom greets ' when the sun goes down.' No one was entrusted with the secret but her mother, and it passed for an ancient song. Lady Jane Scott had her suspicions and old Dalzell, but venerable ladies remembered it being sung in their nurseries, people quarrelled over its antiquity, and antiquarian societies quizzed her impertinently. The song became the subject of a play and a pantomime, it was sung by the camp fires in America, acted by Punch and ' danced by dogs in the street.' The second part was written many years later in compliment to her mother, who wished to hear how the unlucky business of Jeanie and Jamie ended. The sequel is unfortunate. The first part, which Pinkerton termed a silly psalm set to soporific music, will continue to be sung, little Ritson swears, long after *his* printed trash will be completely forgotten or be only occasionally dissembled at the bottom of a pie. How the sorrows are piled on those lovers' heads! How remorseless the march of circumstances, how vain the regrets, how bitter the meeting, how noble the resolve to dree their weird, how strong the sense of duty, how deep the pathos of the little pastoral! Who would have suspected that the kindly old fellow was the author of the whole tragedy, the deep-dyed villain of the sequel? Who would have imagined him guilty of the black crime imputed to him? A thousand times better had Lady Anne remained content with the original. Tragedy enough there was, and broken hearts and brave resolves and common calamity. Rightly the world has preferred the first story and stuck by its hero and resolutely declined to listen to a single word of slander against his character.

Lady Anne was fondly attached to her sister Margaret, who married Mr. Alexander Fordyce when eighteen and had her heart broken by him. The family scattered to India and America. Death came, mourning and uncertainty. Lady Anne resided with the widowed Lady Margaret, in Berkeley Square and met Horace Walpole and Burke and Sheridan and the Prince Regent and the literary ladies of the capital, and at the age of forty-three married Mr. Barnard, the junior son of the Bishop of

Limerick, whom she accompanied to the Cape of Good Hope, on his appointment as Colonial Secretary to Lord Macartney.

How droll the observations she records in her journal, on the ladies who attended her balls at the Castle on the first day of every month, 'mad in white muslin,' and what these Dutch belles wanted was more shoulders and softness of manners. She slept on Table Mountain, sketched the Hottentots, travelled among the Dutch folk in the interior, in a Cape waggon, with her husband and servants and a friend and a cousin, distributed beads and ribbons, with thread and needles, and invented a tale about her four boys in England for their education, and lay down with the others like a troupe of strolling players. After the Peace of Amiens she returned to England, visited her mother in Scotland, and in 1808 her husband died. The following year finds her again in Scotland with her sister, Lady Margaret, and in 1816 the Dowager Countess Ann entered her ninetieth year. In 1823 when reading 'The Pirate,' Lady Anne came upon the verse from 'Auld Robin Gray,' and herself named as the author; then followed her confession, but Sir Walter never met her. Her last task was to sort the family papers. Her old age was serene, placid and contented, and she died in her house in Berkeley Square in 1825.

Up to the present the ladies we have discussed have a unique claim on our attention; they have an unmistakable claim to our remembrance, yet that claim is based on the very slightest of grounds, in every case a single song. It is a slight price to pay for immortality, but were we to establish the invalidity of the claim in a single instance, not all the miniatures on earth could awaken the most fleeting interest in their histories. What other claim to our remembrance would gentle fibbing Lady Wardlaw have, or brave-hearted Lady Baillie or clever Alison Rutherford or shy Jean Elliot, more than a hundred others who snuffed and gossiped and drank tea with them, praised the same songs and dozed under the same sermons? They sang no more sweetly than poor Jean Adams, if indeed it was she who gave us 'The Sailor's Wife,' yet there is perfection in the work. The tragic experience of a nation is compressed into their songs, which teach their lessons of constancy and patience and trustfulness with simple pathos and intensity. Each singer has come forward and taught her lesson and we had done with her. But now we enter on a wider survey—Lady Nairne and Lady John Scott are primarily and definitely poets.

It is not our intention to enter into the details of Lady Nairne's life. She has long been definitely recognised as the

most distinguished of our line of Scottish singers. She had much in common with Lady John Scott—intense Jacobite sentiment, powerful aristocratic instincts, a wide capacity for sympathy, a morbid dread of publicity. Both ladies were reserved and shy before strangers; both possessed an intense religious faith, both were bound up in the past, loyal and patriotic to the core. Neither attempted the more elaborate forms of poetical composition, nor sought to keep abreast with contemporary developements. Both ladies were intensely devoted to nature, and on close and intimate terms with the people. But Lady John is deficient in a sense of humour. Much of Lady Nairne's best work is found in her humorous poems, where the laughter is tender and contagious. Lady Scott is unable to rise above the merely sprightly when she will be humorous, and scenes which in Lady Nairne's hand would have been transformed, are in hers merely colourless. That is one of her gravest defects—a defect which we are inclined neither to minimise nor to dwell upon unduly. But it must inevitably influence our estimate of her work.

Lady Nairne, Carolina Oliphant, was born in the Auld House of Gask in Perthshire, on the 16th of August 1766. Like Lady John Scott she came of a distinguished and ancient Scottish family. The Olifards came to Scotland in the middle of the twelfth century. William Olifaunt acquired land of Robert the Bruce, and became Lord of Gask and Aberdalgie. In 1689 Lord Oliphant was imprisoned for his Jacobite principles and henceforth the fidelity of the family to the House of Stuart never wavered. The father and grandfather of Lady Nairne were out in the '15 and '45, escaped to Sweden and suffered for their king—after whom Carolina was named. Her mother came of good Jacobite stock, the Robertsons of Struan. Lady Nairne's Jacobite songs contain all that is best in poetry of that kind. The whole range of the emotions is included in her songs—hope, enthusiasm despair, humour, pathos. Assured of their popular acceptance and universal appeal before her death, her efforts to preserve her incognito are puzzling and ludicrous. When the Misses Hume were consulted by Mr. Purdie, the music publisher, who proposed (c. 1821) to bring out a volume of Scottish airs with suitable words, Lady Nairne became an enthusiastic contributor. She refused to disclose her identity, assuming the name of Mrs. Bogan of Bogan, employed feigned hands to transcribe her MSS. and visited the hoodwinked publisher in the guise of a Scottish lady of a former generation. She confided the authorship of 'The Land o' the Leal' to her friend, Mrs. Helen Walker, but not to her husband, lest he

should 'blab.' Not until late in life did she acknowledge her authorship of the poem, which was universally ascribed to Burns. Lady Nairne composed her last song in her seventy-sixth year. It was not until after her death that her sister, Mrs. Keith, published a set of poems entitled 'Lays of Strathearn,' to which her name was affixed. Lady Nairne was one of the first to recognise Burns' genius*: it was from him that she conceived the idea of purifying Scottish song; her first attempt in that direction being a new version of a song called the 'Pleughman.' Lady Nairne died on Sabbath, 26th of October 1845.

Like the other poetesses of her line Lady John Scott wrote in the common everyday language of the people. Lady Grisell Baillie, Lady Lindsay and Miss Elliot spoke the language of the farm-house and the glen, and their work is part of the literature of the people. The people's dialect was chosen to express the people's sentiment. They were democratic in the limited range of feelings and expressions, and we should have a departure from reason and naturalism if they attempted anything further. In the early eighteenth century the ways and habits of life of the higher ranks in Scotland differed from those of the lower far less than in later days. This identity of interest has left its peculiar mark on Scottish song—'a winning and lovable 'characteristic.'† But this is scarcely the note in Lady John's poems.

Alicia Anne Spottiswood was born on Midsummer Day 1810. She belonged to one of the oldest families in Berwickshire. An ancestor, Robert de Spotteswood, affixed his seal to the Ragman Roll in 1296, and another, Archbishop of St. Andrews, who wrote 'The History of the Church of Scotland,' crowned Charles I. His son, Sir Robert, the friend of Montrose, died on the scaffold in St. Andrews in 1646 and four years later his nephew, Young Dairsie, suffered by the Royalist's side. Lady John was the daughter of John Spottiswood of Spottiswood, and of Helen Walker, daughter of the Laird of Niddrie-Marischal. She was the eldest of four children—two brothers and two sisters. Very early she fell under the Jacobite influence, for had not the old Laird of Niddrie, when only fourteen years old, tricked the Hanoverian soldiers, by carrying a basket of fruit to the Prince concealing a sum of money, and been held in the royal arms? Jacobitism was almost as real to her as to Lady Nairne. She was passionately attached to her home, an excellent French and Italian scholar, drew well, was taught water-colour painting

* Henderson, 'Lady Nairne and her Songs,' p. 66.

† Sir George Douglas, 'Scottish Minor Poets,' p. xxxviii.

by De Wint, and singing by Garcia, had a fine contralto voice, and of all instruments preferred the harp. She is described as extraordinarily attractive in her youth, as slight and graceful with heavy-lidded, deep blue eyes. She was a distant relative of poor Soph Johnstone, who lived to an extreme old age, a hopeless, shivering, despairing, gruff-voiced woman, starving herself in an Edinburgh garret. She never felt at home in London, and after her marriage to Lord John, * at the time member for Roxburghshire, she stayed in the Clarendon on her rare visits to the Capital. Her first great sorrow fell when her sister Lady Hume Campbell died. From her poems—so largely autobiographical—we knew that Lady John greatly sorrowed. The first trial in her life had come when her sister married Sir Hume Campbell and went to live at Marchmont. † Her thoughts weigh heavily:

> 'I must be sad: it is a vain endeavour
> To smile when all within is gloom and pain.'

Now came the greater trial, and the blank was never filled. She is lonely in her grief. Her tears fall unheeded:

> 'In every thought I miss thee! We alone
> Had dreams and memories to all else unknown.
> They sleep for ever now! That hand is cold
> Whose touch awaked their chords in days of old.'

Three years later the old associations crowd in on her memory and her sorrow quickened. In the midst of the merriment she feels that she is alone in her sorrow. No thoughts of the dead remain; there is laughter in her home—the tenderness of spring is over the earth:

> 'Your voices are not hushed,
> No bitter tear is shed;
> Your spirits are uncrushed,
> And she is with the dead.'

How sad these family poems are, but there is no morbid sentiment. Not for one moment does she abandon her faith in ultimate reunion or break with the past.

Her life was uneventful and she developed a tendency to brood. Death became her Familiar. Her elder brother John died at Torquay ‡ and she devotes two poems to

---

* March 16th, 1836.

† It was at Marchmont that she wrote 'Annie Laurie' in 1839.

‡ 1846.

recording her great grief over his loss. Lord John's nephew Horace Cust was killed at the Alma, and in 1860 the blow fell which came near to overwhelming her. On the 3rd of January of that year Lord John died, and from that time she made Spottiswood her home.

Lady John's Jacobite leanings show in her letters to C. K. Sharpe, the first of which is dated from Newton Don,* *apropos* of the proper costume for an adherent of Prince Charles to wear at a *bal poudré* at Buckingham Palace. Both were intensely interested in Scottish music and costume and Jacobitism, and she was in the habit of singing Sharpe's songs. The correspondence was brought to an end with Sharpe's death.†

Lady John's greatest joy was, in returning to Spottiswood, to catch the first glimpse of the line of dark fir wood :

> 'And the yellow bents and the heather tops'

where the wind has blown it bare. Deeply she realised the sorrow in the breaking up of the old home, when

> The unbroken band of sisters and of brothers
> Upon the weary earth can meet no more'

and the memory of those old times so loved, so cherished. She bore an intense affection for her own people, and as her circle narrowed and friends were called away, the lonely lady fell back more and more on the past and lived in its tender recollections. She gathered a vast hoard of traditional songs and tales and treasured the ancient customs. She read widely and was a lover of poetry, but was out of sympathy with the modern schools, preferring the homely and the direct and the simple. Her own verse was the outlet to express her emotions and sorrows, her solace and comfort, written for her own pleasure and her family circle.

It would appear that Lady John was too imaginative to be practical, that she was masterful and independent, but of great kindness of heart and liable to be duped. She had an excellent memory, loved the freedom of an open-air life, and invariably went about with her sealskin muff and her sketch book, was very dignified, very brave and very uncomplaining. The end came on the 12th of March 1900, and on the 16th, her mother's birthday, the sixty-fourth anniversary of her wedding day, she was laid to rest by Westruther Church. Her poems fall under the headings topographical, historical,

---

* May 1846. † 1851.

Jacobite, ballads, and foreign verse, hymns, family verses and personal. Her family verses have already been mentioned; the foreign verses included in Miss Warrender's volume are trifles, two in French and one in Italian:

> 'La vie n'a plus pour nous
> Les jours de fête, les joies,
> Le délire d'autrefois'

is the commencement of one, a pretty little trifle happily done, characterised by her prevailing sadness, but which need not detain us for a moment.

When we come to Lady John's ballads we have more to say. If we ask what is a ballad and reply a 'song' as Johnson defined it, then we find no limit to the work which might be included under that definition. If we accept the view that the ballad is, for instance, the 'Milldams of Binnorie' and 'Sir Patrick 'Spens' and the 'Douglas Tragedy' and 'Childe Maurice' and things of that sort,* we come nearer to proper definition. The ballad is neither epic nor lyrical, but the theme of the epic and the ballad may be identical and the ballad largely lyrical in tone. 'Yet in modern days thought and reflection, the psycho-'logy of human lives and events, have insinuated themselves 'into the balladist's art, and not seldom he tells his story only 'to make known to his readers what he thinks about it.'† The popular conception of the ballad is that of a story told by the 'makar,' gaberlunzie, blind crowder or rhymer—a story humorous, grotesque, painful, or tragic. The teller of the story adopts an impersonal attitude: he narrates the events he has seen, rarely intruding his personality or permitting us an insight into his feelings during the telling. The balladists of the revival period in the second half of the eighteenth century, those with medievalist leanings, imitated the older models; they sought to catch somewhat of the ancient spirit, the directness and simplicity and intensity of their models, their antique cast; they borrowed their rhythms and attempted to imitate the language as accurately as might be. Since then the art of the ballad-maker has undergone many changes. Folk-song is unique in its expression of the national life—the loves and sorrows, the terrors and superstitions, the feuds and the hates of a people. The ballad is of unknown age. To folk-song we owe the 'Eddas,' the 'Kalevala,' the 'Nibelungen Lied'; and

---

* Edinburgh Review, January 1911: 'Modern Developements in Ballad Art.'

† Ibid.

high in honour the Scôp sang clear in Heorot while the fierce warriors fell silent and forgot their quarrels and drank deeply, with their boar crests and their plated byrnies laid aside. Of Solomon it was said 'And he spake three thousand proverbs 'and his songs were a thousand and five,' and on the mass of secular poetry in Israel the inspired prophets drew:

> 'Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon,
> And thou moon in the valley of Ajalon';

and what was the discovery of the Kenites, the smiths of the ancient world, of which Lamech sang in the beginning! What a splendid legacy the Bretons have bequeathed us in their popular poetry, what pathos, what ceremonies, what blood feuds have been preserved in their song and savage chaunts:

> 'Tis the Gaul's blood
> Runs in flood;
> 'Tis the Gaul's blood!
> I've drunk wine and gore;
> In the war
> I've drunk wine and gore'!

The ballad was originally intended to be sung, as are those of Lady John Scott. Ballad-making was most general in Scotland from the middle of the thirteenth to the beginning of the seventeenth century. The first objective of folk-song is the recording of real episodes, incidents which have left their mark on the countryside, and all true folk-songs are contemporary. It is not to be wondered at that modern ballad-makers can do no more than faintly re-echo the compositions of these early minstrels. Ballad poetry does not emanate from the powerful and the learned; now are these early ballads the composition of one particular individual? There was a mass of floating legendary material—here a singer, there a singer—and in this fashion the tale was taken up and repeated and forgotten and reinvented by the wanderers. The Border ballads were turbulent and full of the spirit of the time. It is impossible to catch their note in our modern complicated life. We can dimly understand the conditions amidst which the ballads were composed, but we cannot shudder at the superstitions nor be assailed by the same terrors and walk about with death, sudden, remorseless and cruel, by our side, nor love and hate as did those Borderers, and weep and groan and laugh with their laughter. We are milder in our moods and our effort to reproduce the rude energy of the time is a conscious, artificial effort. We are bound by certain conventions, tied down by

certain laws. We walk with the dread of the critic before us, we have grown stilted and theoretical and hypersensitive and engrossed with the invention of the plot and the smooth working of the machinery. Watson and Ramsay and Percy did a vast service for our literature. They changed the current completely; they showed us what had been done, but it was impossible to teach the old art. At first it appeared there was nothing simpler than imitation of these old ballads. Lady Wardlaw was partially successful and exposed her forgery by the 'needlework so rare.' Lady John lived in the heart of the Border country; the old memories were ever with her, the old melodies constantly in her ears; she had no theories of seeking a new outlet for herself, but hummed her tunes and wove words for them. But she did not realise the change that had come over the whole art of ballad-making and that the vein was worked out. Romantic colouring, an antique air her ballads have, but they bear the impress of her age heavily. The modernisation of the technique of the ballad is a recognition that successful reproduction of the old is impossible. The Reformation killed the art of ballad-making, and printing and the decay of chivalry. The plain, bald narrative with the rarest intrusion of the singer, the hurried action, have been replaced by elaborate pictorialism, the intrusion of philosophical or aesthetic conceptions and admitting of allegorical interpretation. Nor does the modern ballad make its appeal to the same circle, to rude, untutored men, unconscious of such an idea as that of intellectual fellowship, ignorant of and unconscious of all but their immediate passions and affections, men willing to listen to a tale with which they have been familiar from childhood, who gripped the sword more tightly at the recital, and the look in their eye became fierce and they forgot kirk and priest and were ready to break all the man-made, God-given laws. The art of ballad-making has become elaborate and complicated, the ballads appreciated only by a limited circle in complete intellectual sympathy. Only a few are capable of understanding the aesthetic appeal, the developement of the initial idea, the striving towards the realisation of self.

Lady John has done a dangerous thing in simulating the ancient ballads. She attempts to set back the clock to the middle of the eighteenth century, to the period of the ballad revival. Only contemporary ballads can reflect the age; the 'Fairy Queen's Courting' is, we imagine, one of her least successful. The ancient ballads relating to spirits and supernatural creatures are of great beauty. Occasionally we have to

complain of a bad rhyme. She simulates excellently the old reiving spirit in 'Bide in your bower,' and the savage state of society in which it was found—its turmoil, its generosity, its despair. In the 'Cruel Stepmother' we have the ancient motif, but again the fatal note of modernity jars on our ears :

> 'On the braes o' the forest it's pleasant to dee ;
> For saftly I lie, wi' the snaw driftin' free
> An' the birk boughs are waving a welcome to me.'

We are forced to the conclusion that Lady John was in error in thus attempting to revive the past in the old style. Such tales have been already told by their proper tellers—by the men who plundered and hacked and butchered and wept, and forgot holy kirk, and were fierce as wolves and tender as little children. They have their descendants in the Borders, who have turned their swords into pruning hooks and hob-nob at markets and are douce Presbyterians and dour and stubborn as any in Scotland, but there is no laureate to record their dust.

We venture to assert however that Lady John will occupy high place in the list of writers of Jacobite songs. Lady Nairne was born as the struggle was expiring. Her home was imbued with the Jacobite sentiment. What tales must the old laird have told his daughter in the Auld Hoose, of Cope and his dragoons, and the Prince and Culloden, and his years of lonely exile. What a chivalrous old gentleman it was who entered in his family register the simple words 'Carolina, after 'the king,' at Gask. With what veneration the young girl must have gazed on the bonnet, the brogues, the crucifix, the spurs and the lock of hair, which 'the leddy sae genty' who 'sheltered Scotland's heir,' clipt with her own fair hand, and which unfortunately for romance is barely in accordance with fact. How the old laird of Stroyan, her uncle, must have treasured those songs of his niece, which breathed such fervent loyalty to the king and such glowing patriotism. Lady John was a stage further removed from the actual movement, but she too had heard tales from one who had spoken with the Prince. Jacobite song in the Lowlands was not contemporary with the movement. Half a century elapsed before it became popular. During this period it would have been a flagrant act of sedition to have sung a Jacobite song in public, and during the progress of the Rebellion there was little time for sentiment. The moment the danger was past and the smug citizens of Edinburgh could sleep soundly in their beds o' night, the political significance of the Rebellion sank into the background and a warm, generous enthusiasm sprang up for the brave and bigoted men

who had suffered and dared and lost all. The pathos and misery of the dead cause made their appeal—an appeal for which no expression could be found when men dealt blows, and cursed governments and were hounded and done to death on the hillsides, and the women prayed and wept and their children starved. As late as the early decades of the nineteenth century, it was considered disloyal to sing these songs. But the matter was otherwise in the Highlands.

There we have spontaneous song—fierce passionate appeal, awaking hope, despairing resignation. The first and greatest of the Jacobite bards, Alexander Macdonald, teacher, catechist, dictionary-maker, farmer and soldier, was born in 1700. He was the son of an episcopal clergyman in Moidart. When the Prince landed and unfurled his standard at Glenfinnan, Macdonald hastened to put his services at the disposal of the Royal invader, and we have the picture of the bard, furiously inspired, extemporising the 'Tearlach MacSheumas,' with yellow-haired Royalty seated smilingly on the brawny knee. Macdonald's poems exercised a powerful influence over the spirits of the Highlanders. This is from the soul-stirring 'Song of the Clans.'

> 'Your friends are weary-hearted,
> So long from us you stay,
> Like fawns from mothers parted
> Or bees whose store is taken
> By fox, while they forsaken
> Lie dying on the brae;
> Then to our succour hasten
> And clear our foes away.'

A similar strain breathes throughout the whole poem. Of Morag he sings his sweetest song—Morag the lovely one in ringlets, who has journeyed across the sea. Haste back, child of love, he cries,

> 'Beloved of many
> Troops of maidens round you pressing
> Fit to dress the red cloth neatly.'

Return, Morag, with the face divinest, my soul is flaming with love for you. The Gael will show his love for you, will bide with you tho' all the world will leave you.

> 'Hasten then will all your maidens,
> These will aid the work and cheer you
> Agus ho Mhorág, ho horò
> 'Sno hō-rè ghealladh.'

How tender his lines are, how ardent the affection they breathe, how fierce their resolve, how fearless their loyalty! The note of exultation and confidence gives way to that of sadness and hopeless despair in John Roy Stuart. Like Macdonald, Stuart was both soldier and bard in the Prince's army. His work is filled with regret for the failure of the cause. Alas! that the Prince should be chased and the Right banished and the Truth disgraced. Now we are trampled beneath the feet of our foes,

> 'Our lands and our dwellings
> Are wasted and felled to our face.'

In the woods and the glens are hiding the faithful, scattered and hunted, their calling like the owls heard at the falling of night. Stuart is the poet of pessimism of the cause. Despair has him in its grip, and silence and night.

Lady John regards the movement from a different perspective. Her first song is a stirring appeal to the Prince's true followers:

> 'Shame on ye, gallants, that rise not readily;
> Rouse ye and march at your Prince's call.'

The news has come from Moidart.

> 'The winds are singing a welcome to Charlie
> And the rebels are running before him the day,'

and there is joyous confidence in the youth and strength of the hero. Then the note of the singer changes, the jubilant is replaced by the reflective:

> 'We've lookit for ye lang, Prince Charlie,
> Thro' years o' disgrace and pain.'

'Haste ye, Morag. One toss of that yellow hair, one glance of that eagle eye, and the crown is yours.' 'I've cast off my satin 'petticoat' is steeped in the sentiment of the time. How prominent the ladies were in the movement, how the gudeman trembled at their rash enthusiasm, when the wild Highlanders swooped down and ate him out of house and home, and his wife shouted herself hoarse for the Cause at his ear. How the handsome adventurer won the hearts and turned the heads with his full blue eyes and eyebrows arched rarely. The wife of the laird of Moy joined the Prince in opposition to her husband, and when the Chevalier rode down the High Street and the dour Whigs scowled and muttered and peered behind their windows, and jeered and scoffed in their balconies, and

hung about the close heads dourly, and the Jacobites went mad over their brief triumph, Lady Murray of Broughton appeared in his train on horseback, covered with white ribbons. Jeannie Cameron of Glendessery, Lady John's heroine, whose nephew was a minor, set off for the Prince's camp at the head of two hundred and fifty followers, clad in a seagreen riding habit, with a scarlet lapel trimmed with gold, and her hair in loose buckles and a velvet cap and scarlet feathers, on a bay gelding, and a naked sword in her hand, and remained with the tatterdemalion host till it marched to England, rejoined them when they recrossed the Border, was present at the battle on Falkirk Moor, taken prisoner and committed to the Castle of Edinburgh. By she threw her siller seam, her spinning wheel, and the harp she played upon sae rarely, and in her pathetic death song the whole fountain of love and trust and loyalty wells up, and her last words breathe complete and full self-surrender to her king:

'My deepest love is thine, Charlie, it's a' I hae to gie,
An' lay me in the mools, Charlie; an' think nae mair o' me!
Thy step maun be the first, Charlie, amang the free and brave;
There's a Crown and a Throne for thee, Charlie, an' for me, my lonely grave!

But alas, the Jacobite dream was fated to dissolve. Like John Roy Stuart she laments fatal Culloden:

'Curst be Culloden, blasted for ever . . .
For our Prince hunted down;'

Alas, how fatal that day, the prince hunted, our hearts forlorn and wae:

'No hope for the morrow,
No balm for the past.'

The story is ended, black darkness and night has settled on the land, and worst of all, a dark stain rests on the memory of the Beloved Prince. Why did they force thee from the field, my Prince? Why didst thou not die as thou didst live, my hero? Was it for thee to wander like a hunted deer, to part with all thy high resolves, to eat out thy heart in unavailing remorse? For us thou art no broken adventurer with hanging head and despairing breast.

'*We* see thee ever brave and fair.'

Lady John's story of the '45 is unrelieved tragedy. Most of all she is oppressed by the tragedy of Culloden. She is the singer of Culloden as Jean Elliot is of Flodden. She dare not

hope, the story is ended, the final farewells taken. Lady John Scott will be the last of the Jacobite singers.

But we imagine Lady John's finest work is found in her topographical poems. Love of nature is inherent in the Scottish poets. They have described it ever since Gavin Douglas set the fashion in his Prologues. It was a Scotchman—James Thomson—who took the lead in a highly artificial age, in restoring nature love to poetry. No less have our minor poets been distinguished for this peculiar affection, which has not shown itself in fondness for mere abstract descriptions. The poets are attached to a particular district, they dwell on its minutest features, they live and move and have their being in its atmosphere. The poetry of Lady Nairne and of Lady John Scott is peculiarly associated with their native districts. 'Durisdeer' is written in reflective mood and tinged with Lady John's peculiar melancholy. We shall go far before we find a piece of such genuine pathos as this :

'Far up into the wild hills, there's a kirkyard auld and still,
Where the frosts lie ilka morning, and the mists hang low and chill;
And there ye sleep in silence, while I wander here my lane,
Till we meet ance mair in Heaven, never to part again!'

What an exquisite suiting of the sound to the sense in these lines, an emotional intensity in the picture of the wild hills and the cold, still churchyard, with its frosts and the mist hanging over it and the silent dead. She is deeply attached to her wild and stormy Lammermuir. She hates the dreary southern land :

'O murmuring waters!
The sounds of the moorland I hear,
The scream of the her'n and the eagle,
The bell of the deer.'

Her love for her home is her mastering passion. She sees the wild ducks gathering on the moors, the geese far overhead, the moorfowl folding his wing over the first green sprigs of heather, the primrose on the rocks, and the burn, wild with the melting of the snows. A perfect thing is her Ettrick.' There is a glorious ring and swing in the first verse :

'When we first rade doun Ettrick,
Our bridles were ringing our hearts were dancing,
The waters were singing, the sun was glancing,
An' blithely our voices rang out thegither,
As we brushed the dew frae the blooming heather,
When we first rade doun Ettrick.'

That first ride is never to be forgotten—the keen sense of exhilaration in God's sunshine, the bridles ringing and the voices glad and the heather in bloom with the dew heavy upon it—and the very waters singing. How changed the singer's mood in the next verse! Melancholy creeps in and a cloud falls across the day. A slow, measured movement creeps into the verse—the colouring is darker, the day is dying, the leaves falling, the hearts heavy and weary, the voices silent and the heather faded. No jingling bridles, no blithe voices from the moorland; the steeds are jaded and worn and the wild birds calling mournfully:

> 'When we next rade doun Ettrick
> The day was dying, the wild birds calling,
> The wind was sighing, the leaves were falling,
> An' silent an' weary, but closer thegither,
> We urged our steeds thro' the faded heather,
> When we next rade doun Ettrick.'

Last of all the storm is waking and the winds shifting—and a heart is breaking:

> 'For we never again were to ride thegither
> In sun or storm on the mountain heather.'

We do not know the full story of the tragedy, but the poem is typical. Lady John's prevailing mood is melancholy. Her joy endureth but for a moment. Perpetual association with the past augmented her tendency, until she was incapable of shaking off her mood and laughing glad laughter. The prevailing note of the folk-songs in which her mind was steeped was one of melancholy, of dull resignation, of tragic despair. But coming last of all, when Scotland has largely lost its speech, its distinctive nationality, and its power of song, we are not to look for the strong and hearty laughter of youth in the aged and the sad.

And now we are almost at the end of an 'auld sang' which closes sadly after the fashion of songs of old age. The concert has been good, and the singers modest, and we have not done with their songs which have been strummed and hummed and brought tears to the eyes for a hundred and fifty years. But we cannot conceal from ourselves, that, as we become more cosmopolitan we are compelled to recognise that their notes are not of our day and that the art of singing them has been lost. There is nothing distinctively Scottish in David Gray and Alexander Smith. Still another Border poetess with Border blood in her veins and a love for Scotland in her heart has

definitely abandoned the old style. Lady John Russell has left us a few fugitive verses. Shortly before her death Lady John wrote an apostrophe to 'Death,' verses full of feeling and strength and earnestness:

> 'Thou whose silent tread
> Not ocean, chasm, or mountain can delay,
> Not even hands in agony outstretched
> Or bitterest tears of breaking hearts . . .
> When my hour striketh, when with Time I part,
> When face to face we stand, with naught between,
> Come as a friend, O Death!'

Our song writers set themselves no task of elaborate psychological analysis. Death walked with them, and Love and Hope and Faith, and were accepted as inevitable in the scheme of things. For none do we claim first rank. They are simply minor poets, proud women with simple hearts who had the gift of song and loved their countryside, as have thousands of voiceless ones. But now we may gather up our wraps, for the concert is over, and the night is ready to swallow us up.

Art. XI.—GREAT BRITAIN AND EUROPE.

1. *Speeches by the Rt. Hon. Sir Edward Grey, Bart., M.P., in the House of Commons,* 27th of November and 14th of December 1911.
2. *Speeches by Lord Courtney of Penwith, Lord Morley of Blackburn and the Marquess of Lansdowne, in the House of Lords,* 28th of November 1911.
3. *Memoirs and Letters of the Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Morier, G.C.B., from* 1826 *to* 1876. By his daughter Mrs. Rosslyn Wemyss. London: Edward Arnold. 1911.

Once again we have to call attention to the singular contrast presented by the prudence and courage with which, on the whole, since 1905, Ministers have conducted Imperial affairs—Foreign, Indian, Colonial—with the lack of statesmanship or rather the utter recklessness, shown in the management by the same men of the most important home interests. The levity with which Ministers persist in treating the whole subject of national finance, the injury they have inflicted upon our parliamentary system, the lowering of the character and reputation of both branches of the Legislature and the exalting of the power over legislation of the Executive Government, will leave behind them evil consequences for many a year to come. Passing their measures by first reducing the House of Commons to the level of a mere mechanical instrument for turning out within a certain time *any* legislation ordered by the Government, Ministers are looking forward to employing in a new session the same methods to repeal the Union by establishing a National Irish Parliament and Executive in Dublin, to introduce manhood suffrage (and womanhood suffrage too if the counsels of the majority of the Cabinet are followed), and to disestablish and disendow the Welsh Church. No one of course denies that each of these three sweeping projects requires consideration, and deserves to be threshed out by the fullest parliamentary debate. But to be of use, the debating must be real, the merits and demerits of proposals must be genuinely canvassed, and the House of Commons, if it would retain the respect of the public, must remember, and the Government should learn, that it is not the sole function of representatives to become the mandatories of party leaders, party whips, and party caucuses.

To a great extent the expectations both of friends and opponents of the Government which dissolved Parliament in 1906

have been disappointed. Few Free Traders in that year would have predicted the wild plunge into national extravagance that was to signalise a year or two afterwards Mr. Lloyd George's entrance upon the business of the Exchequer. National economy and Free Trade had in former days usually gone hand in hand. The Opposition at the General Election of 1906 were, however, equally mistaken in their anticipations. Their eloquence was largely devoted to assuring the electors that a Liberal triumph would mean the ruin of the Empire, the falling away of Colonies, the descent of the nation from its high place amongst the Great Powers of the World. All Liberals were Free Traders. All Free Traders were Cobdenites! All Cobdenites were 'Little Englanders'! This was the Protectionists' creed of half a dozen years ago which they vainly endeavoured to force on the British electorate. It is difficult after all these years to see either in the financial or the foreign policy of the Government much that would have recommended it to Mr. Cobden; however much the retrograde financial and commercial principles of latter-day Conservatism would have revolted him. Till recent times the Chancellor of the Exchequer was the faithful guardian of the public purse. In performing his duties he incurred, as he expected to incur, hostility and censure, from those powerful and popular forces that constantly pressed him for increased expenditure. To-day the Chancellor of the Exchequer throws his weight into the other scale, that of national extravagance. For the first time in our history the Exchequer has been made use of, in the interest not of economy but as a useful standpoint from which to popularise national expenditure and extravagance. On a modern House of Commons the responsibility even for the annual Budget seems to sit lightly indeed; yet the Liberals of to-day consider themselves the inheritors of the principles of Mr. Gladstone!

During the past few months the country has been greatly stirred by rumours of severe tension in the relations between ourselves and Germany. Fortunately, perhaps, the general public did not realise the peril till, for the time at least, the particular difficulty of the moment was at an end. When it did wake up to the dangers of the situation, some indiscriminate and ill-informed censure of the Foreign Secretary and of the Government found a voice, as it was quite to be expected that it would. Was it possible, it was asked, that war should break out between two such Powers as Great Britain and Germany on account of a diplomatic breakdown in the French and German negotiations about Morocco? Was it a British

interest—one worth fighting for—that a great French Empire should rise in North-west Africa and along the shores of the Mediterranean? Was the Anglo-French *entente*, which has met with general approval, to be construed as a treaty of alliance which bound us to give military assistance to the French in the case of the rupture of Franco-German relations brought about by the rivalry of the two Powers for influence in West Africa? It was not our business, it was said, to promote the ambitious projects of either Power against the other. It was further urged, and with truth, that it was hardly possible to exaggerate the monstrous calamity to the world and to themselves of a war between the British and German Empires. Would even a successful war, it was asked, in which the Franco-British alliance triumphed add greatly to British security in the future and in the long run, by establishing the military primacy in Europe of a France enlarged, in all probability, to its 'natural frontiers,' and with the southern shores of the Mediterranean also in its hands? Of late years the Germans and British had doubtless found themselves on several occasions in diplomatic antagonism. Trade rivalries between the two nations were keen. In the newspaper press of the two countries there had been manifested much ill-feeling and bickering. Surely, however, there remained enough good sense in both countries to prevent—unless the most substantial grounds of policy could be alleged for it—a rupture certain to be fraught with almost immeasurable ills. Surely, the nation ought not to be committed to a war of such tremendous significance as a mere consequence of the breakdown of diplomatic negotiations conducted behind its back and without its knowledge. Parliamentary explanation and discussion were thus clearly called for, if the Government was to carry with it general opinion—the opinion, that is, not only of those excited persons who apparently would be delighted to welcome any occasion for a Franco-British military alliance against Germany; but also of that large, more staid and less demonstrative section who believe the maintenance of the peace of Europe to be the greatest, or almost the greatest, of British interests.

The average British citizen does not and cannot follow the intricacies of foreign politics. To some extent the same thing may be said of our Houses of Parliament. It is evidently impossible whilst diplomatic negotiations are being carried on that the patriotic and sensation-loving press of all countries should be called into council;—that is, if harmony, the object, or ostensible object, of the negotiations, is to be attained. But the

British public and Parliament on its behalf, certainly does well to insist that the broad lines of the national policy should be explained to it. What alliances have been made, and what is the extent and the object of them, Parliament has, of course, a right to know; and assuredly it would and ought to resent the country's being committed to a general line of policy as to which it had not been consulted. Debates on foreign affairs in Parliament may have their occasional inconvenience; but they are as nothing in comparison with the good that is done in keeping in touch and in full harmony the policy of the Ministry and the general sentiment of the nation. It is easy to exaggerate the mischief done by the foolish speech of some irresponsible Member of Parliament or Peer. In our country, and in other countries, occasional exhibitions of wrong-headedness and folly are necessary incidents of popular debate. But here and elsewhere, if leading statesmen in and out of office feel their responsibilities and do their duty, individual eccentricities and outbreaks do little harm beyond shocking the proprieties of a formalism somewhat out of date in these democratic days. During the late session of Parliament the House of Commons as a whole treated the subject of foreign policy with good sense and dignity; and the result of the debates has been to give increased strength to Sir Edward Grey in dealing on behalf of his country with international affairs.

It usually happens that when the relations between this country and the Continental Powers tend to become acute, there is a tendency for public opinion to diverge along old and well-worn lines. From the one side we hear much of our 'insular 'position,' of what is called 'non-interference,' of 'splendid 'isolation' and so forth. We are reminded on the other side that in the past our own liberties as well as the liberties of Europe have only been saved by Great Britain sharing with Continental nations in their struggles against military despotism and aggression. The 'Balance of Power,' the 'Concert of Europe,' alliances and *ententes*, are in everyone's mouth. Yet if history has anything to teach our statesmen in directing the foreign policy of the country, it is in the constant testimony it bears to the necessity of avoiding pedantic adherence to some previously accepted formula or supposed principle, and the advisability of founding policy on the actual then existing conditions of the time.

In our very first volume,* at a most critical moment in

* Edinburgh Review, January 1803.

British history, a few months only before Napoleon began to gather at Boulogne the legions destined to form the 'Army of 'England,' we published a somewhat elaborate essay, weighing the practicability and expediency of maintaining a policy of British aloofness from Continental affairs, as against that 'balancing system' under which it behoved us to add our strength to that of other threatened nations against the overweening power of the great French military despotism. Did the fact that we were an Island State put us outside the dangers and exempt us from the risks and burdens which threatened and oppressed the less happily situated nations of the mainland? 'Many politicians,' we then wrote, and the same may be said to-day,

'who have no hesitation in recommending the balancing system to such Powers as Austria and Prussia, placed in the heart of Europe and surrounded by many other States of various sizes, are yet of opinion that the situation of Britain is very different; that she is by nature insulated from the rest of Europe; that she can defend herself against any invasion by means of her natural barrier and internal resources; and that she ought not to sacrifice the improvement of these resources, and the means of maintaining peace, to the vain wish of holding the European balance, and embroiling herself in the stormy politics of foreign States.'

These opinions young Henry Brougham (for he was the writer of the article) could not share. In his view the English Channel and the sea served rather to unite our interests than to separate them from those of the Continent.

'Our insular situation served to extend and promote our commercial relations; and so long as other nations possess a large portion of sea coast, engage in a wide commercial circle and are acquiring a heavy and formidable power; so long as Britain interferes with them in other portions of the globe where her dominions are the most valuable and extensive; it is an abuse of language to talk of her being separated from the Continent of Europe by the Straits of Dover.'

Later in that year abstract discussion on the rival merits of the two 'systems' gave place to the universal feeling that the facts of the time admitted of no alternative policy. And Great Britain entered upon the war which was the only means of preserving the liberties of Europe and her own.

There have been other times when our statesmen have rightly concluded that complete aloofness from the political game being played for their own advantage by rival Continental Powers was the wisest and most dignified attitude for this country to adopt, other nations well understanding that this

aloofness would come to an end if their proceedings threatened the rights or welfare of the British Empire. During Lord Salisbury's Premiership and management of foreign affairs, Lord Goschen, who possessed very intimate acquaintance with Continental politics, in 1899 emphatically denied that what was called British 'isolation' involved our being without friends on the Continent of Europe. If trouble came he had no doubt that for their own sakes, as well as our own, powerful allies would be forthcoming. Our isolation, such as it was, was self-imposed. 'We had only to hold up our hands 'and it would terminate, and we should receive a welcome into 'several groups of other Powers.' We were in a stronger, not in a weaker, position from having kept ourselves free from Continental entanglements. The sanguine temperament of Mr. Gladstone carried him further perhaps than any other British statesman in the belief that our geographical position saved us from all the dangers and even the temptations to which neighbouring nations were exposed. He saw in England the one great disinterested Power. She had long outgrown the desire for expansion of territory; and the nations of the world might well look to her as likely to prove a just arbiter of the disputes of others. 'We should seek to found a moral empire upon the 'confidence of the nations, not upon their fears, their passions 'or their antipathies.'* Mr. Gladstone's ideals and aspirations were always lofty ones; but his wishes too often decided his view of hard, stubborn facts. We could not, if we would, become on the Continent, he declared, an aggressive military nation; for circumstances had decided beyond all question that we were 'an essentially, incurably, maritime Power.'

Sir Robert Morier's 'Memoirs and Letters,' skilfully and with much knowledge edited by Mrs. Rosslyn Wemyss, afford excellent reading. They are full of instruction for those who would understand the foreign politics of Europe in the third quarter of the nineteenth century. The fact that they were written for the most part in the confidence of great intimacy, and therefore under little restraint from feelings of diplomatic reticence and discretion, does not make them less attractive to the ordinary reader. Brilliant and capable as he was, it is impossible to place implicit confidence in his judgment. Indeed we think Morier was not seldom egregiously mistaken in his estimate of a situation, in the advice which he tendered, and in his opinion of contemporary statesmen. The vehement and slap-dash style in which he expressed his feelings called forth from his friend and corre-

* Article by Mr. Gladstone, Edinburgh Review, October 1870.

spondent, Stockmar, a warning 'against the pleasure of hating 'and the love of exaggeration.' The truth was, that whilst Morier loved Germany he hated Bismarck. 'Pray remember, 'my dear fellow,' he replies to Stockmar in December 1870, 'that if I do not love Jünkers, the Militär Cabinet, and the 'three-haired Lieutenant-General (Bismarck), it was in your 'academy that I made my study of German politics.' Three years later he wrote that 'as long as Gladstone and Lord Gran-'ville are in power we must submit to rank with Denmark and 'Holland in the family of nations.' In 1874 he looked forward with much confidence to seeing the position of England abroad 'steadied' by the hand of Lord Derby. On general grounds, whilst he thoroughly distrusted Gladstone, Morier had been little attracted by his political opponents. 'It is Conservative '*statesmen* the country wants (1873), not Conservative party 'leaders filling up *the room of statesmen*.'

We do not, however, on this occasion propose to follow Morier's career, or to discuss at length these interesting volumes to which we have called attention mainly because they give forcible illustration of the great and useful service to Europe and the world which it is in the power of a wise and courageous British statesmanship and diplomacy to render. If Mr. Gladstone's hopes ran away with him in dreaming of an England which should hold the place of the revered and trusted arbiter of the nations, it is hardly open to dispute that we often have it largely in our power to promote and maintain the general peace of the world. Englishmen to-day might address Mr. Asquith's Ministry and the Foreign Office in language very similar to that of Jowett's letter to Morier in October 1873 :*—

'If you cannot succeed in preventing the greatest calamity that can befall the world, your diplomacy is nothing and your life a failure, even though you are Ambassador at Paris or Constantinople. If you can succeed you will be one of the most eminent men in Europe. Nothing seems to me worth doing or having in foreign politics which does not prevent war. If war breaks out, it is "Fold up the map of Europe," and there is an end. . . .'

Morier (November 1873), though a lover of peace, was hardly able to account war as always and inevitably the '*summum malum*.'

'We must, of course, try to prevent a European war, but what, *per fas aut nefas* and at the cost of any amount of war, we must prevent is a second duel between France and Germany. To prevent this I would even side with France, however in the wrong she might be.'

* Vol. ii. p. 288.

In July 1870 Morier went so far as to say that the Franco-German War might have been prevented by the firm action of the British Ministry. Yet this view seems to us to be quite inconsistent with his own accurate diagnosis of the situation, viz. the determination of Germany to coalesce and form a German Empire, and the determination of the French to prevent this unless they received ample compensation elsewhere. The story Morier tells is so characteristic that we give it verbatim. He was dining on the 15th of July 1870 with the Prince of Wales at Marlborough House, the Duke of Cambridge and Mr. Delane being amongst the guests.

'During dinner the telegram from Paris announcing the declaration given by the Government in the *Corps Législatif* was received by Mr. Delane. I was formally *interpellé* and called upon to give my opinion on the "situation," and so I took up a parable and said: "The war could have been prevented if for twenty-four hours the British people could have been furnished with a backbone; it is too late now. France and Germany will have to fight it out alone, it will be the most horrible war the world has ever seen, and it will end by France being thoroughly and completely beaten." The Duke of Cambridge asked what would be the use of a backbone without an army, which we had not got. I ventured to observe that this was an instrument which Germany possessed in great perfection, but this was not my meaning. What I meant was that there were certain moves on the political chessboard which necessarily led to checkmate, and that good players did not go on playing after these were executed. There was one thing known positively to everyone who had to do with European politics during the last fifteen years: which was that Louis Napoleon would *never face* a coalition between England and Germany; consequently all that would have been necessary would have been to indicate the move. But for such a coalition, even *in posse*, a backbone was necessary, as mere dolls filled out with bran are not taken into account.'*

Sir Edward Grey, when on the 27th of November last he undertook to explain the recent policy of the Government, had an anxious and difficult task before him. Rumours—exaggerated no doubt, but with, nevertheless, a substantial basis of fact behind them—had lately filled the air. We had been, it was said, on the very brink of immediate war with Germany. What conceivable issue over the details of an agreement between France and Germany relating to Morocco, it was asked, could possibly justify such a war? What could be the alleged cause, what the probable result to ourselves and to Europe, of so great a catastrophe as an Anglo-German conflict? Parliament

* Vol. ii. p. 154.

had not been consulted. It was an outrage on popular government that the nation, behind its back, should have been so committed to a French alliance, as to be dragged into a quarrel, which was none of its own, with a nation with which it was of the greatest importance that we should remain at peace. These doubts and questionings came mainly from members of Sir Edward Grey's own political party, thereby adding to the difficulties of his position. Would he be able to show in the face of Europe—and it was of supreme importance that he should—that the British Minister for Foreign Affairs and the Cabinet had behind them the practically united and determined support of the British nation?

'The Foreign Secretary frankly laid the whole case before Parliament without any concealment or any exaggeration, carefully abstaining from making any appeal to the excited feelings of his own countrymen and from all language which might irritate the susceptibilities of others. Seldom has a greater triumph been achieved by a British Minister! After a day's debate in each House of Parliament and the subsequent discussion in the press, and after every opportunity had been afforded to professional and independent criticism to do its utmost to discredit and disparage the conduct of the Government, it was made absolutely clear that national opinion was as nearly as possible unanimous in its approval of the policy and action of Sir Edward Grey. It was one of those triumphs in which the average Englishman rejoices. There was, it was true, nothing to dazzle. There had been no striking *coup*. There was no display of blatant music-hall 'Imperialism.' It was a triumph of moderation, firmness, and common sense. But it was recognised on all hands, both at home and abroad, that the British Ministry, whilst speaking moderately, had meant what it said; and the nation was fully prepared, if necessary, to make good its words.

Sir Edward Grey abstained in his speech from taking any wide survey of international politics, confining himself to the particular difficulty that had arisen with regard to Morocco; and only, thereafter, glanced incidentally at the general European situation. We did not profess, he said, to have any special interest or direct concern in the negotiations that were going on for exchanges of territory in Africa between France and Germany. Those Powers were the principals in these negotiations, in which we had only a subsidiary part to play. But, on the other hand, the Foreign Secretary saw clearly that in these negotiations there might at any time arise a difficulty and a difference which, if unsettled, would alter the whole Moroccan situation and the

relation in which that country stood to Europe. It was impossible to dispute that such a result would be fraught with danger to the maintenance of European peace, which it was the great object of the British Minister to secure.

On the 1st of July last the German Ambassador had informed Sir Edward Grey that in consequence of representations from certain German firms and employés at Agadir it had been decided to send a man-of-war to protect German interests in that place, a closed port on the Atlantic in Southern Morocco. The German explanation of this step caused Sir Edward far more anxiety than the step itself, for it convinced him 'that the 'German Government regarded a return to the *status quo* in 'Morocco as doubtful, if not impossible, and that what they 'contemplated was a definite solution of the Moroccan question 'between Germany, France, and Spain.' What then, he asked himself, was the solution Germany was aiming at? In that lay the kernel of the whole question. Was it to be the partition of Morocco, or what was it to be? On the 4th of July, after having laid the facts before the Cabinet, the German Ambassador, at his request, again called at the Foreign Office, and was informed that

'the British attitude could not be a disinterested one with regard to Morocco. We must take into consideration our treaty obligations to France and our own interests in Morocco. We were of opinion that a new situation had been created by the despatch of a German ship to Agadir. Future developements might affect British interests more directly than they had hitherto been affected, and *therefore we could not* recognise any new arrangements that might be come to without us.'

Though Sir Edward had made it quite clear to the Ambassador that his language was expressly authorised by his Majesty's Government, no information whatever was given as to the definite solution which Germany might have in view. A little afterwards information reached Sir Edward that

'the German Government had actually made demands with regard to the French Congo of an extent to which it was obvious to everybody who thought of it that neither the French Government nor the French Chamber could agree. That at once made me anxious as to the developement of the situation. If Germany was going to negotiate with France an arrangement by which Germany received from France something in the French Congo and left France in Morocco as she was under our agreement of 1904, then, of course, we were prepared to stand aside and not to intrude. If, however, Germany, starting negotiations on that basis with France, made demands, not for a portion but for the greater part of the French

Congo or anything of that kind, it was quite clear France must refuse those demands, the negotiations would be thrown back on some other basis and the question of the possible partition would arise again.'

As Germany still offered no explanation, the anxieties of the Foreign Office did not diminish; and accordingly the Chancellor of the Exchequer was authorised by Sir Edward Grey and the Prime Minister to declare, in a speech in the City of London on the 21st of July, that where British interests were concerned other nations must remember that Great Britain was not to be left aside as of no account. 'If,' said Sir Edward in the House of Commons, 'the time ever comes when this cannot be 'said by a Minister speaking in the position the Chancellor of 'the Exchequer was then in, we shall have ceased to exist as 'a great nation.' That may well be; but however moderate may have been Mr. Lloyd George's language, personality in our foreign relations counts for much, and we should much prefer that utterances of this sort should be made, not at a City dinner by some rhetorical colleague, but by the Prime Minister or the Foreign Secretary himself in the House of Commons, or by the representative of the Government in the House of Lords. The effect of the speech was to make each nation more inclined to 'stand on its dignity' and less inclined to enter into frank and friendly explanation with each other. The German Ambassador had given privately to Sir Edward satisfactory explanations as to what had happened at Agadir, but his Government had declared that it was 'not consistent with their dignity' that this explanation should be made public, as it would give the appearance of their having yielded to what they considered the offensive language of Mr. Lloyd George; whilst Sir Edward Grey felt that 'the tone of the communication from the German 'Government made it inconsistent with *our* dignity to give 'explanations as to the speech of the Chancellor of the Ex-'chequer.' More than ever had it become clear that in case the French and German negotiations should break down a most formidable situation would arise. Fortunately, at the end of the month Anglo-German intercourse became more satisfactory. Germany sent us a communication friendly in tone not only to ourselves but to France as well; and this was, of course, met by Sir Edward Grey in the same spirit. The German Foreign Secretary stated in the Reichstag that Germany had never contemplated the acquisition of any part of Morocco, and Sir Edward Grey did his best to persuade Germany that it had been his object to promote the success of the negotiations between France and Germany, not to thwart the aspirations of

the latter Power. Sir Edward's comment, that a little more frankness earlier in the day on the part of the German Foreign Office would have avoided a good deal of the misunderstanding that had arisen, was entirely justified.

Why, then, when French and Germans by means of a little reasonable 'give and take' had brought their own negotiations to a conclusion—a conclusion of which we ourselves had no sort of wish to complain—should there have been a sudden outburst of popular excitement both in England and Germany, a great increase of mutually hostile feeling, and the talk even of the rupture of the relations between the two nations? All over the world there have been and are wars or rumours of wars, and in our own country Sir Edward Grey did well to complain that

> 'there were people who seemed to delight in discussing how near we have been, or are, or are likely to be, either to revolution or war, in the past, the present, or the future. Really it is as if the world were indulging in a fit of political alcoholism, and the best that can be done by those of us who are in positions of responsibility is to keep cool and sober.'

That there had been real anxiety—'diplomatic anxiety'—in the month of September, not constant but intermittent anxiety, he fully admitted—not, indeed, that he expected an immediate rupture, but he was afraid of a situation ultimately arising a satisfactory issue from which it was very difficult to forecast. Against such a possible danger it was, beyond all dispute, the bounden duty of the Government to make provision and to be prepared. Should the Franco-German negotiations have broken down, the desire of our Foreign Office would have been to summon a conference of the Powers which had been parties to the Treaty of Algeçiras; but Sir Edward Grey, after having sounded German wishes on this point, felt little expectation that such a proposal would have their support, in which case it would be wiser not to make it. Hence the British Foreign Secretary was bound to contemplate as a probability, or at least a possibility, the sudden collapse of negotiations, with France, Germany, and Spain, all in actual occupation of Moroccan territory, and Great Britain, who had solemnly asserted her right to be consulted, excluded so far from the negotiations altogether. Certainly that was a situation which any British statesman deeply concerned in maintaining the peace of the world would do his best to prevent.

It added to the interest of the debate in the House of Commons that for the first time Mr. Bonar Law appeared on a subject of supreme importance as leader of the Opposition. He gave

to the Ministry ungrudging support, and pointed out that Sir Edward Grey was, in fact, loyally carrying out, and carrying further, the policy of the last Unionist Government. It was under their auspices that the French *entente* had begun, and it was then hoped that this policy might be followed up by similar agreements with other Powers. With Sir Edward Grey he deprecated much of the foolish and mischievous talk of the day (which, however, it would be useless to shut one's ears against), that owing to divergent interests between the two countries, a war sooner or later between Great Britain and Germany was 'inevitable.' For his part, he never believed in these inevitable wars. He remembered when precisely the same thing used to be said of our relations with Russia. 'If war should ever come, which Heaven forbid, it would not 'be due to irresistible natural laws. It would be due to the 'want of human wisdom.' What was needed was that each nation should understand the other and realise its strength, and should realise also that however great in each country might be domestic differences, and from whatever party the Government of either might be drawn, each nation was prepared to maintain to the last her own interests and honour. A speech in every way worthy of the high and responsible position to which Mr. Bonar Law had just succeeded.

In the House of Commons nothing was said that amounted to effective criticism of the Government in its management of the Moroccan trouble, though some complaint was made that its general line had been anti-German in spirit and in manner and too much dictated by a sense of imagined obligations to France and Russia. Why, asked Mr. Ramsay MacDonald on behalf of the Labour party, should we be encouraging Russia at a time when her bureaucracy was endeavouring to stamp out parliamentary institutions at home, and to crush out nationality in Persia?

In the House of Lords a much more formidable critic both of the immediate action of the Government as regards the Morocco difficulty, and of the general tendency of its foreign policy, was found in Lord Courtney of Penwith. We had been thinking so much of our *entente*, he declared, that we had almost lost sight of the still more recent Algeçiras Treaty. Under that arrangement our first duty was to maintain the integrity of Morocco, but we had made up our minds to rely entirely upon French statements, and to see everything through French spectacles. He could hardly bring himself to believe that Sir Edward Grey had informed the German Ambassador of the unacceptableness of certain rumoured

German demands"; and the first essay in diplomacy 'of the 'Chancellor of the Exchequer,' he considered 'deplorable,' and responsible for raising most unnecessarily a great deal of additional bad feeling in Germany. Apparently Lord Courtney did not realise the difficulties and dangers that would almost certainly have followed from the breakdown of negotiations, from an attempted partition of Morocco, and from the obstacles likely to be thrown in the way of a general conference of the Powers. In our opinion Sir Edward Grey conclusively showed that the means he took, especially in speaking quite clearly to the German Ambassador, were the best that could have been taken to secure European peace, and a just settlement of the immediate question. Lord Courtney's criticism, which undoubtedly represents a certain amount of popular feeling as to the general attitude of the Government, requires fuller consideration.

Had Lord Courtney's observations been directed against the anti-German spirit which has found expression in a portion of our press, and in quarters where a greater calmness and sense of responsibility might have been expected, we should largely have agreed with him. The remarks made by Lord Lansdowne in debate, not less than those of Sir Edward Grey, prove, however, that amongst British statesmen of both parties the Anglo-French *entente* of 1904 was not intended, and has not been made use of, as an aggressive move against Germany. It was intended to remove certain causes of friction between ourselves and France, and has been most successful in so doing. The same happy state of things now exists between ourselves and Russia. Let us try by all means to improve in the same degree our relations with Germany. The aspirations of Lord Courtney are shared by the chief statesmen of both British parties; and for our part we cannot doubt that if the general tone of public discussion follows the lead that has been so well set in Parliament, a better state of feeling between the two countries will begin to grow up. In Germany, as well as at home, there is manifested amongst statesmen, now that the immediate difficulty has been got over, a desire to make a fresh start in amicable relations between the nations. Indeed, German statesmen have not been afraid to offend the susceptibilities of their more excited and militant countrymen, by maintaining a friendly and pacific tone towards Great Britain, when addressing their own countrymen. This deserves recognition. In both countries 'political alcoholism' has existed, and it is very satisfactory that in both responsible statesmanship has kept its head.

Lord Courtney would have us drop a system of *ententes* or alliances, which he terms 'exclusive,' in order to return to the 'Concert of Europe.' Our Foreign Office however cannot pay sole regard to general abstract theory of what might be best for the world. It has to deal with the actual facts of the time. It is the very essence of many European troubles that the Great Powers are aiming at diverse and inconsistent ends. Nothing is to be gained at such a time by crying out for a 'concert' where there is no 'concert'; though that should not deter us from endeavouring to bring about a greater harmony, and so render a 'concert' once more possible. As we have already said, these expressions, 'concert,' 'isolation,' 'balance of power,' must all be understood with reference to the existing facts and political situation of their own day. It is not by slavish adherence to any one of them that British foreign policy can be wisely conducted. For the time being Sir Edward Grey has shown the wisdom, and indeed the necessity, of maintaining in full cordiality our existing *ententes*; though we certainly could not agree with him in any sweeping condemnation under all circumstances of the independent and self-reliant attitude which at times Great Britain has rightly assumed, and which is sometimes travestied under the name of 'isolation.'

There is one fact which largely dominates the European situation of the present time—a fact of which, as Lord Morley rightly pointed out, Lord Courtney seemed to be unaware—the gigantic and ever-growing war fleet of Germany. Yet how can any British Ministry—the guardians and trustees of the Empire—in its outlook on foreign affairs totally ignore such a fact as that? Are the exertions that have been made on our side, which, of course, will be maintained as long as they are required, to retain the sovereignty of the seas, misunderstood in Germany? It is difficult to suppose that German statesmen do not recognise that our measures are being taken with no aggressive object, but solely to maintain our own security and the peace of Europe. That a different view is held by many in Germany who are less well-informed is largely to be attributed to the effect of irresponsible utterances and writings in England, and on the Continent. The German public may very easily be led by them into believing that an attack on Germany by several great allied Powers is in contemplation. That most assuredly is not the British object in adhering firmly to her friendships with France and Russia; and Germany may rest content that those friendships will certainly not have the effect of rendering

British power subservient to the separate ambitions of others, should any such exist.

The parliamentary debate can hardly fail to have done good both at home and in Germany. But in both countries much more still requires to be done by those who can influence public opinion, to lessen misunderstandings and to restore mutual confidence. Parliamentarily Sir Edward Grey has achieved a splendid success. His language has been clear, firm, and unprovocative. His great end, the peace of Europe, has been maintained in critical times very largely, we firmly believe, through his own steadfast and unfaltering conduct of affairs. Sir Robert Morier, were he with us still, could hardly have repeated his ejaculation of nearly half a century ago: 'How could Great Britain without a backbone and without an 'army expect to maintain the peace of the world?'

To us, then, it seems that the main lines of the foreign policy of the country at the present time have been inevitably marked out for it by the existing conditions of the European situation. The debates in Parliament showed that there was no practical alternative, and that had Mr. Balfour and Lord Lansdowne been in power the same line of policy would have been pursued. Moreover it is difficult to believe that any other Foreign Secretary could have treated an admittedly difficult and dangerous situation with more firmness, moderation, and good temper than have been shown throughout by Sir Edward Grey. So far, then, we can look back upon recent events from the British standpoint, with a good deal of satisfaction. Had this critical business been badly handled the most disastrous consequences might have ensued. But when this has been said, we can find little else in the existing political situation in Europe, or in our relations with Foreign Powers, that is a subject for much rejoicing. The question now is—what can be done to bring about a happier state of things; and by its success in that field the future foreign policy of the Government will be judged.

We do not doubt that responsible statesmen both in Germany and in Great Britain are honestly desirous to bring about a better understanding between the two nations. Till that has been accomplished the European situation cannot be one of stable equilibrium. There may be no real cause of quarrel; but whilst feelings remain excited, and 'political 'alcoholism' is prevalent, any small incident or accident, which at other times would have hardly raised a difficulty, may easily become distorted into a question endangering

international peace. British statesmanship and diplomacy have to convince Germany, by their conduct, of their desire for more friendly relations, and of their sincere repudiation of the notion that the progress and prosperity of Germany are inimical to British interests and sentiments. On the other hand, is Germany with feverish zeal to be for ever increasing her war fleet? Now

> 'Facts are chiels that winna ding,
> And downa be disputed,'

even by Lord Courtney; and Germany can hardly expect that so portentous *a fact* should not entail consequences in the general European situation.

In this country we do not believe that the recent strain has in any way tended towards the exacerbation of anti-German feeling. On the contrary the possible nearness of actual rupture, the realisation of the appalling consequences that would have followed it, the calm unprovocative language of our statesmen of all parties, have awakened amongst us a keener sense of the mischief that the reckless, irresponsible shoutings, intended to fan popular excitement and too common in recent years, may cause. We certainly look forward to an improved tone on the British side in the popular discussion of these questions. For an equal improvement of tone in German public opinion, we may have some time to wait. As we have already said, official statesmanship in Germany has used the language of moderation; but a large section of the German newspaper press, of fire-eating professors, of literary men, and of the militant classes, have come to see in Great Britain the implacable enemy of German aspirations. It would be foolish to expect this feeling to die down at once; but recent years have given us many examples of the completeness with which sentiments of national hostility have often evaporated. So may it be with Germany!

It is not many years since events on the Upper Nile brought France and Great Britain, to-day the best of friends, into measurable distance of rupture. Sir Edward Grey, who now enjoys in France as in England credit and popularity for his support and conduct of the *entente*, had in the House of Commons given notice to the world at large that British work on the Upper Nile was not to be interfered with by the incursion into that region of any other European nation. Accordingly, when subsequently a French expedition made its appearance at Fashoda, the Unionist Government, giving effect to the language

of their predecessors, at once gently but firmly insisted upon its withdrawal. This demand provoked an extraordinary outburst of French popular indignation; and Englishmen were warned by men conversant with French feeling that a spirit of hostility to Great Britain had in France quite taken the place of the old hatred against Germany; and that it was across the Channel that Frenchmen would thenceforth see the implacable enemy of their country.

British relations with the United States of America are to-day as friendly and cordial as they are with France; yet it is not so many years since the sudden interference of America in the dispute between Great Britain and Venezuela produced a tension between the two great English-speaking nations, which, but for the calm imperturbability of Lord Salisbury, might easily have led to conflict. As a matter of course much excited language was used on both sides of the Atlantic during 'the 'crisis'; and we were solemnly invited to see in words indicative merely of a temporary loss of temper, evidence of a permanent and deep-seated enmity between the two kindred nations. Indeed, elaborate reasons were adduced in America to show how natural and inevitable it was that 'the Americans 'should hate the English.' With Fashoda and Venezuela in our recollection, we see no reason for anticipating that the existing 'soreness' of Germany will be found irremoveable.

These ebullitions of temper are dangerous enough for the moment, but it is easy to exaggerate their importance and meaning, if only statesmen can remain calm enough to tide over the period of temporary excitement, and so let the public regain its composure. This is what happened in the two examples cited. On the other hand, it is impossible to minimise the danger to the peace of the world arising from the total disregard by powerful nations of principles of general international morality. We are much afraid that European peace is maintained to-day, less by the acquiescence of the Powers in a state of things acknowledged to be right and satisfactory, than by the fear of each Power of the military strength of some rival or rivals. We share with Lord Courtney the wish to see a Concert of Europe, whose joint sense of what is just and generally desirable should prevail over the national self-seeking and ambition of individual Powers. But recent years have shown how little the world can feel any sense of security against the violence of the strong.

Seldom has there been a greater outrage upon all the decencies of international relationship than the sudden announcement

by Italy a few weeks ago that a large province of the Turkish Empire had become part of the Italian dominions, followed by the despatch of an army to reduce its inhabitants by force into subjection. Other recent examples of flagrant disregard of international rights and equities could easily be given. Yet these things call forth no general or serious remonstrance; and the effect of silent acquiescence in wrong cannot but tend to encourage lawless violence wherever it suits a great Power to have recourse to it against a weak one. We hear much talk in these days of Peace Congresses and Conferences and Hague resolutions, but we are as far as ever from having discovered any sanction for compelling obedience to what is prescribed. Against the pressure of national self-interest is there much reason to suppose that in time of trial the Great Powers of the world will show absolute respect for the hampering prescriptions of some modern code? The effectiveness of what is called International Law depends on the respect paid to it by free and independent nations, and it can hardly be said that there is much disposition nowadays in individual nations to have regard in time of emergency to anything beyond their own immediate interests.

In that matter of self-interest, of course, lies the drawback that exists and has always existed to what have been called 'exclusive alliances,' as compared with 'good understandings.' The interests and objects of allied Powers cannot be precisely the same. Friendly relations between Great Britain and Russia fortunately exist, but this does not mean that the two nations have identically the same objects of Asiatic policy. So with the understanding between Great Britain and France. Our object is primarily to maintain the peace of Europe by showing a strong front against aggression. We have no desire to rearrange maps in either Asia or Europe. This is as well understood in Paris and in St. Petersburg as in London. British power will certainly not be utilised to further, by anything in the nature of aggression on others, ends which are not its own.

It cannot be said that the New Year opens with very bright prospects. The nations are competing against each in the scale of their preparations for war. Let us hope that this means that they want peace. It is a long time now since between the great nations of Europe the peace has been broken. With, on the one side, the vast growth in modern times of commerce and industry, and of intercourse between the citizens of foreign states, and on the other side the increase of armaments

and the so-called improvements in the art and engines of war, it has become quite impossible to forecast or realise the far-reaching and disastrous consequences of a conflict between the Great Powers of Europe. We rejoice to know that British influence has told, and will continue to tell, strongly on the side of Peace.

No. CCCCXL. will be published in April.

THE

EDINBURGH REVIEW,

APRIL, 1912.*

No. CCCCXL.

Art. I.—CARDINAL NEWMAN.

1. *The Life of John Henry Cardinal Newman.* By Wilfrid Ward. London: Longmans. 1912.
2. *History of My Religious Opinions.* By J. H. Newman, D.D. London: Longmans. 1869.

The life of Newman was divided into two nearly equal portions by his change of religion in October 1845. For the earlier half of his career we have long had his own narrative; and Newman is a prince of autobiographers. It was his wish that the 'Apologia' should be the final and authoritative account of his life in the Church of England, and of the steps by which he was led to transfer his allegiance to another communion. The voluminous literature of the Tractarian movement, which includes large collections of Newman's own letters, has confirmed the accuracy of his narrative, and has made any further description of that strange episode in English University life superfluous. With the 'Apologia' and Dean Church's 'Oxford Movement' before him, the reader needs no more. Mr. Wilfrid Ward has therefore been well advised to adhere loyally to the Cardinal's wishes, by confining himself to the last half of Newman's life, after a brief summary of his childhood, youth, and middle age till 1845. Nevertheless, it is misleading to give the title 'The Life of 'Cardinal Newman' to a work which is only, as it were, the second volume of a biography. There are very few men, however long-lived, who have not done much of their best work before the age of forty-five, and Newman was certainly

* All rights reserved.

not one of the exceptions. From every point of view, except that of the Roman Catholic ecclesiastical historian, Newman's Anglican career was far more interesting and important than his residence at Birmingham. He will live in history, not as the recluse of Edgbaston, nor as the wearer of the Cardinal's hat which fell to his lot, almost too late to save the credit of the Vatican, when he had passed the normal limit of human life, but as the real founder and leader of nineteenth century Anglo-Catholicism, the movement which he created and then tried in vain to destroy. The projects and failures and successes of his later life seem very pale and almost petty when compared with the activities of the years while he was making a chapter of English history. His greatest book, though it was written many years after his secession, is the record of a drama which ended in the interview with Father Dominic the Passionist. It is 'The History of my Religious 'Opinions'; and after 1845 his religious opinions had, as he says himself, no further history. The incomparable style which will give him a permanent place among the masters of English prose was the product of his life at Oxford, where he lived in a society of highly cultivated men, whose writings show many of the same excellencies as his own. Newman's English is only the Oriel manner at its best. Such an instrument could hardly have been forged at the Birmingham Oratory, where his associates, who had followed him from Littlemore, were of such an inferior type that Mark Pattison, who knew them, was surprised that he could be satisfied with their company. His best sermons and his best poetry belong to his Anglican period. 'The Dream of Gerontius,' with all its tender grace, is far less virile than 'Lead, kindly Light,' and other short poems of his youth. Moreover, his record as a Roman ecclesiastic is one of almost unrelieved failure. If he had died eighteen years after his secession, when he already looked upon himself as an old man whose course was nearly run, he would have been regarded as one who had sacrificed a great career in the Church of England for neglect and obscurity. From the first he was distrusted by the 'Old Catholics' (the old Roman Catholic families in England), and suspected at the Vatican, where Talbot assiduously represented him as 'the most dangerous man in England.' When Manning, Archdeacon of Chichester, followed his example and joined the Roman Church, Newman was confronted with a still more subtle and relentless opponent, whose hostility was never relaxed till the accession of a Liberal Pope made it no longer possible to resist the bestowal of tardy honours upon a feeble

octogenarian. The recognition came in time to soothe his decline, but too late to enable him to leave his mark upon the administration of the Roman Church.

The main events in a very uneventful career are narrated at length in Mr. Ward's volumes. After his 'conversion' Newman first resided in a small community at Maryvale (Oscott) but soon left it on a journey to Rome, where he spent some time at the Collegio di Propaganda, and had a foretaste of the distrust with which Pius IX and his advisers always regarded him. His plan at this time was to found a theological seminary at Maryvale; and in this scheme he had the support of Wiseman, the ablest Roman ecclesiastic in the United Kingdom. But the 'Essay on Development,' with its unscholastic language and unfamiliar line of apologetic, seriously alarmed the theologians at Rome; and Newman, accepting the first of many rebuffs, abandoned this project in favour of another. He resolved to join the Oratorians, an order founded by St. Philip Neri, and obtained permission to modify, in his projected establishment, the rules of the Order, which, among other things, prescribed frequent floggings in public. He visited Naples, and came back a believer in the liquefaction of the saint's blood. The amazing letter to Henry Wilberforce, written from Santa Croce, shows that he was the most docile and credulous of converts. Even the Holy House at Loreto caused him no difficulty. 'He who floated the ark on the surges of 'a world-wide sea, and inclosed in it all living things, who has 'hidden the terrestrial paradise, who said that faith might 'remove mountains . . . could do this wonder also.' It 'may have been'; 'everybody believes it in Rome'; therefore Newman 'has no doubt'!

The new Oratory was placed by Papal brief at Birmingham. The first members of it were his friends who had left the English Church with him. Recruits soon came in, and branch houses were talked of. But for many years Newman had reason to complain of neglect and want of sympathy. He even found empty churches when he preached in London. In conjunction with Faber, he next started a series of 'Lives of the Saints,' in which the most absurd 'miracles' were accepted without question as true. The 'old Catholics,' who had no stomach for such food, protested; and Newman, this time thoroughly irritated, had to admit another failure. The Oratory, however, and its London offshoot under Faber were prosperous, and the churches where Newman preached were not long empty. In 1850 we find him in better spirits. He employed his energies in a series of clever lectures on 'Anglican Difficulties,' in which

he ridiculed the Church of his earlier vows with all the refined brutality of which he was a master. But he was soon in trouble again. One Dr. Giacinto Achilli, formerly a Dominican friar, gave lectures in London upon the scandals of the Roman Inquisition, which had imprisoned him for attacking the Catholic faith and fomenting sedition. The temper of the British public at this time made it ready to believe anything to the discredit of the Roman Church, and Achilli became a popular hero. Wiseman published a libellous article upon him in the 'Dublin Review,' which passed unnoticed. But when Newman repeated the charges of profligacy in a public lecture, Achilli brought an action for libel, which in costs and expenses cost Newman 12,000*l*. The money however was paid, and much more than paid, by his co-religionists. This trial was quickly followed by the inauguration of a scheme for founding a Catholic University in Ireland, the avowed object of which was to withdraw young Catholics from the liberalising influences of mixed education. This scheme was sure to appeal strongly to Newman. Liberalism had come in with a rush at Oxford, after the dissipation of the 'long nightmare' (as Mark Pattison calls it) while the University was dominated by religious medievalism. The Oxford of Newman had become the Oxford of Jowett. The ablest of Newman's young friends and disciples, such as Mark Pattison and J. A. Froude, were now in the opposite camp, full of anger and disgust at the seductive influences from which they had just escaped. Newman, as might be expected, was anxious to protect Catholic students from similar dangers, and accepted the post of Rector of the proposed Catholic University. He intended it to provide 'philosophical defences of Catholicity and Revelation, and 'create a Catholic literature.' The lectures in which he expounded his ideals at Dublin were a great success, and he returned to England full of hope. With a curious inability to read the character of one who was to be his worst enemy, he offered Manning the post of Vice-Rector. Manning's refusal was followed by his failure to obtain the support of Ward, Henry Wilberforce, and others ; and Catholic opinion in Ireland was much divided. For three or four years Newman was engaged in ineffectual efforts to push his scheme forward. At last, in 1855, he was installed as Rector, and began his work at Dublin. A fine church was built at Stephen's Green with the surplus of the Achilli subscriptions, and Newman produced some excellent literary work in the form of University lectures and sermons. But the whole movement was viewed with distrust by the Irish ecclesiastics, who, as he said in a moment

of impatience, 'regard any intellectual man as being on the 'road to perdition.' There was a cloud over his work from first to last. He had been promised a bishopric, without which he was made to feel himself in an inferior position by the Irish prelates; but the promise was not fulfilled. The Irish objected to one or two English professors on his staff, because they were English. Dr. Cullen, the ruling spirit in the Irish hierarchy, was a narrow conservative, who wished to use Newman merely as an instrument against progressive tendencies in church and state. In 1857 he resigned an impossible task, and returned to Birmingham.

New undertakings followed, no more successful than the abortive university scheme. There was to be a new translation of the Bible, and a new Catholic magazine called the 'Rambler.' The former enterprise was already well advanced when the general indifference of the Catholic public caused it to be abandoned. The 'Rambler,' the contributors to which used a freedom of discussion unpalatable to Roman ecclesiastics, struggled on amid a storm of criticism till 1859, when Newman, who was then himself editor, resigned, and one more humiliating failure was registered. The management of the magazine passed into other hands. The Oratory School at Birmingham, a much less contentious undertaking, was successfully launched in the same year.

In 1860 came the emancipation of the States of the Church by Cavour and Victor Emmanuel. Newman referred to the Piedmontese as 'sacrilegious robbers,' but his advocacy of the temporal power was not strong enough to please the Vatican, while the strength of Manning's language left nothing to be desired. Newman became more unpopular than ever. His reputation suffered by his former connexion with the 'Rambler' and his supposed connexion with the 'Home and Foreign 'Review,' which Acton intended to represent the views of progressive Catholics, till it also was snuffed out by the hierarchy. The five years from 1859 to 1864 are considered by Mr. Ward to have been the saddest in Newman's life. He felt, truly enough, that the dominant party had no sympathy with his aims, and that he was treated as 'some wild incomprehensible beast, 'a spectacle for Dr. Wiseman to exhibit to strangers, as himself 'being the hunter who captured it.' 'All through my life I 'have been plucked,' he writes to an old Oxford friend. There was even in his mind at this time a wistful yearning after the friends and the Church that he had left—a feeling, doubtless transient, but significant, which his biographer has allowed to show itself in a few pages of his book. After reminding

himself, in his diary, of the warning against those who, after putting their hand to the plough, 'look back,' he proceeds to look back, because he cannot help it.

'I live more and more in the past, and in hopes that the past may revive in the future . . . I think, as death comes on, his cold breath is felt on soul as on body, and that, viewed naturally, my soul is half dead now, whereas then [in his Protestant days] it was in the freshness and fervour of youth . . . I say the same of my state of mind from 1834 to 1845, when I became a Catholic. It is a time past and gone—it relates to a work done and over. "Quis mihi tribuat, ut sim iuxta menses pristinos, secundum dies, quibus Deus custodiebat me? Quando splendebat lucerna eius super caput meum, et ad lumen eius ambulabam in tenebris?" . . . I have no friend at Rome; I have laboured in England, to be misrepresented, backbitten and scorned. I have laboured in Ireland, with a door ever shut in my face. . . . Contemporaneously with this neglect on the part of those for whom I laboured, there has been a drawing towards me on the part of Protestants. Those very books and labours which Catholics did not understand, Protestants did. I am under the temptation of looking out for, if not courting, Protestant praise. . . . What I wrote as a Protestant has had far greater power, force, meaning, success, than my Catholic works.'

Such reflections might seem to indicate a disposition to return to the Anglican fold. But a man must have vanquished pride in its most insidious form before he can leave the Church of Rome for any other. The aristocratic *hauteur* of the *civis Romanus* living among barbarians lives on in the sentiment of the Roman Catholic towards Protestants. When Newman was publicly charged with intending to return to Anglicanism, this spirit broke out in a disagreeable and insulting manner.

The bitterness of these five years of neglect, in which he had been eating his heart in silence, must be remembered in connexion with the famous Kingsley controversy, which in 1864 roused him to put on his armour and fight for his reputation. There had always been an element of combativeness in Newman's disposition. '*Nescio quo pacto*, my spirits most 'happily rise at the prospect of danger,' he wrote early in life. And when he could persuade himself that not only his honour but that of the Church was at stake, he could feel and show the true Catholic ferocity, the cruellest spirit on earth. 'A heresiarch,' he had written even in his Anglican days, 'should 'meet with no mercy. He must be dealt with by the competent 'authority as if he were embodied evil. To spare him is a 'false and dangerous pity. It is to endanger the souls of 'thousands, and it is uncharitable towards himself'! This was the temper, soured by defeat and not mellowed by age,

which Charles Kingsley, in an evil moment for himself chose wantonly to provoke. At Christmas 1863 there appeared in 'Macmillan's Magazine' a review of Froude's 'History of 'England,' in which Kingsley wrote 'Truth for its own sake has 'never been a virtue with the Roman clergy. Father Newman 'informs us that it need not be, and on the whole ought not to 'be—that cunning is the weapon which Heaven has given to 'the saints wherewith to withstand the brute male force of the 'wicked world.' This charge was in fact based on a careless reading, or an imperfect recollection, of the twentieth discourse in 'Sermons on Subjects of the Day.' The discourse in question is a somewhat nauseous glorification of the servile temper, but it only says that the meekness of the saints is (by Divine providence) so successful that it is always mistaken for craft. The *imputation* of cunning is therefore a note of sanctity in its victim. Kingsley ought to have read the sermon again, and withdrawn unreservedly from an untenable position. But he thought that something less than a complete apology would serve; and so gave Newman the opportunity of his life. When the withdrawal which he offered was rejected, Kingsley made matters ten times worse for himself by an ill-considered pamphlet called 'What then does Dr. Newman 'mean?' In this effusion he vents all his scorn and hatred for Catholicism—for its tortuous tactics, its monstrous credulity and appetite for miracles, which must proceed, according to him, either from infantile folly or from deliberate imposture. Forgetting altogether that he has to defend himself against a specific charge of slander, he offers his great opponent the choice between writing himself down a knave or a fool—a knave if he pretends to believe in the Holy Coat and the blood of St. Januarius, a fool if he does believe in them.

The coarseness of this attack upon an elderly man of saintly character and acknowledged intellectual eminence, who had to all appearance blighted a great career by honestly obeying his conscience, offended the British public, which was now fully disposed to give a respectful and favourable hearing to whatever Newman might care to say in reply. In a Catholic country it would have been useless for a Protestant, however falsely attacked, to appeal to Catholic public opinion for justice; but Newman understood the English character, and saw his splendid chance.

The famous defence was, from every point of view except the highest, a complete triumph. And although Hort was strictly accurate in describing the treatment of Kingsley as 'horribly unchristian,' it is demanding too much of human

nature to expect a master of fence, when wantonly attacked with a bludgeon, to abstain from the pleasure of pricking his adversary scientifically in the tender parts of his body. The bitterest passages were excised in later editions; and the 'Apologia' remains a masterpiece of autobiography, and a powerful defence of Catholicism. To Newman this appeared to be the turning-point in his fortunes. He felt strong enough to administer a severe snub to Monsignor Talbot, his old enemy, who, hearing of the success of the 'Apologia,' invited him to preach at Rome. Then at once he threw himself into a great scheme for founding an Oratory at Oxford. Eight and a half acres were bought between Worcester College, the Clarendon Press, the Observatory, and Beaumont Street, a magnificent site, which the Oratorians acquired for only 8400*l.* But here again he was thwarted. W. G. Ward opposed the scheme with all his might, insisting on the necessity of 'preserving the 'purity of a Catholic atmosphere throughout the whole course 'of education.' The whole tendency of the Ultramontane movement was to secure, before all other things, a body of militant young Catholics to fight the battles of the Church. Newman was willing to support the English Church in its warfare against unbelief; to the Ultramontane a Protestant is as certainly damned as an atheist, and is more mischievous as being less amenable to Catholic influence. Manning and Talbot seem to have given the project its *coup de grâce* at Rome, and Newman sold the land which he had bought. He was bitterly disappointed; but the growth of public esteem had given him self-confidence, and he did not again fall into despondency, though he had a strange presentiment of approaching death, which prompted his last famous poem, 'The Dream of 'Gerontius.' A second attempt to go to Oxford was thwarted by enemies at Rome and in England in 1866–7. The extreme party, with Manning, now Archbishop, at their head, seemed to be victorious all along the line. They were able to proceed to their supreme triumph in the Vatican Council which issued the dogma of Papal Infallibility. Newman, while others were intriguing and haranguing, was quietly engaged in preparing his subtlest and (on one side) his most characteristic work, 'The Grammar of Assent,' an attempt at a Catholic apologetic on a 'personalist,' as opposed to an 'intellectualist' basis. He declined to take an active part in the theological conferences about infallibility, being by this time well aware how little weight such arguments as he could bring were likely to have at Rome. He was disgusted at the insolent aggressiveness of the Ultramontanes, but he had no wish to combat it. The

situation was hopeless, and he knew it. The death of several friends increased the sense of isolation, and during the years 1875 to 1879 his silence and depression were very noticeable to those who lived with him. His dearest friend, Ambrose St. John, was one of several who died about this time. But Trinity College, Oxford, made him an honorary fellow in 1877, an honour which seemed to prognosticate the far higher distinction which was soon to be conferred upon him.

The death of Pius IX in 1878 brought to an end the long reign of obscurantism at the Vatican, and with the election of Leo XIII Newman emerged from the cloud under which he had remained for more than a generation. The new Pope lost no time in making him a Cardinal, though even now the prize seemed to be on the point of slipping through his fingers. He valued the honour immensely as setting the official seal of approbation on his life's work, and the last ten years of his life were quietly happy. He was able to mingle actively in affairs of public interest, and to write long letters, till near the end. He died on the 11th of August 1890, in his ninetieth year, and was buried, by his own request, in the same grave with his friend Ambrose St. John.

Why is it that this sad, isolated, broken life, in which the young man renounces the creed of the boy, and the elder man pours scorn upon the loyalties of his prime; which found its last haven in a society which wished to make a tool of him but distrusted him too much for even this pitiful service, has still an absorbing interest for our generation? For it is not only in England that Newman's fame lives and grows. In France there is a cult of Newman, which has produced biographies by Bremond and Faure, as well as a history of the Catholic Revival in England by Thureau-Dangin. In England, besides Dean Church's 'Oxford Movement,' we have biographies by R. H. Hutton and W. Barry, and appreciations or depreciations by E. Abbott, Leslie Stephen, Froude, Mark Pattison, and several others.

The interest is mainly personal and psychological. Newman's writings, and his life, are a 'human document' in a very peculiar degree. Bremond is right in calling attention to the *autocentrism* of Newman. 'Although (he says) the words "I" 'and "me" are relatively rare in Newman's writings, whether 'as preacher, novelist, controversialist, philosopher, or poet, 'he always reveals and always describes himself.' Even his historical portraits are reconstructed from his inner consciousness; hence their historical falsity—all ages are mixed in his histories—and their philosophical truth. In a sense he was

the most reserved of men. We do not know whether he had any ordinary temptations; we do not know whether he ever fell in love. But the texture of his mind and the growth of his opinions have been laid bare to us with the candour of a saint and the accuracy of a dissector or analyst. He reminds us of De Quincey, who also could tell the story of his own life, but no other, and whose style, like his own, was modelled on the literary traditions of the eighteenth century.

He has left us, in the 'Apologia,' a picture of his precocious and dreamy boyhood, when he lived in a queer world of his own, peopled by angels and spirits, a world in which the supernatural was the only nature. He was lonely and reserved, then as always. It is not for nothing that in his sermons he expatiates so often on the impenetrability of the human soul. A nature so self-centred has always something hard and inhuman about it; he was loved, but loved little in return. And yet he craved for more affection than he could reciprocate. 'I cannot ever realise to myself,' he wrote once, 'that anyone 'loves me.' It is a common feeling in imaginative, withdrawn characters. Deepseated in his nature was a reverence for the hidden springs of thought, action, and belief. When he spoke of 'conscience,' as he did continually, he meant, not the faculty which decides ethical problems, but the undivided soul-nature which underlies the separate activities of thought, will, and feeling. In this sense the epigrammatist was right who said that 'to Newman his own nature was a revelation which he 'called conscience.' He 'followed the gleam,' uncertain whither it would lead him. The poem 'Lead, kindly Light' is the most intimate self-revelation that he ever made. This mental attitude, which he took early in life, became the foundation of his 'personalist' philosophy, and of the anti-intellectualism which was the negative side of it. But this reliance on the inner light, which nearly made a mystic of him, was clouded by a haunting fear of God's wrath, which imparts a gloomy tinge to his Anglican sermons, and which, while he was halting between the English Church and Rome, plied him with the very unmystical question 'Where shall I be most *safe*?' an argument which he had used repeatedly and without scruple in his parochial sermons.*

It is nevertheless true that this self-centred spirit was, at least in early life, impressionable and open to the influence of others. His friendship with Hurrell Froude and Keble affected his opinions considerably; and still more potent was the per-

* Cf. e.g. Parochial and Plain Sermons, vol. vi. p. 259.

vading intangible influence of Oxford—the academic atmosphere. It cannot indeed be said that the University was at this time in a healthy condition. Mark Pattison has described with caustic contempt the intellectual lethargy of the place, and the miserable quality of the lectures. Oxford was still *de facto* a close clerical corporation, and in most colleges 'clubbable men' rather than scholars were chosen for the fellowships. Oriel won its unique position by breaking through this tradition, and also by making originality rather than success in the university examinations the main qualification for election. But even at Oriel, and among the ablest men, there was great ignorance of much that was being thought and written elsewhere. Knowledge of German was rare. Even the classics were not read in a humanistic spirit. 'Of the 'world of wisdom and sentiment—of poetry and philosophy, 'of social and political experience, contained in the Latin and 'Greek classics, and of the true relation of the degenerate and 'semi-barbarous Christian writers of the fourth century to that 'world—Oxford, in 1830, had never dreamt.'* Theological prejudice in fact distorted the whole outlook of the resident fellows, and confounded all estimation of relative values. Newman never, all through his life, took a step towards overcoming this early prejudice. He imagined a golden age of the Church, or several golden ages, and found them in 'the first 'three centuries,' in the time of Alfred the Great or of Edward the Confessor, or in the seventeenth century. He was only sure that the sixteenth century was made of much baser metal. This unhistorical idealisation of the past, even of a barbarous past, was very characteristic of Newman and his friends. They bequeathed to the Anglican Church the strange legend of an age of pure doctrine and heroic practice, to which it should be our aim to 'return.' The real strength of this legend lies in the fact that it has no historical foundation. The ideal which is presented as a return or a revival is nothing of the kind, but a creation of our own time, projected by the imagination into the past, from which it comes back with a halo of authority. Newman had his full share of these illusions. In his youth and prime he was more of an Englishman than an Anglican. He despised foreigners, unless they were Catholic saints, could not bear the sight of the *tricolor*, and hated all the 'ideas of the Revolution.' His dictum, 'Luther is dead, but 'Hildebrand and Loyola are alive,' throws a flood of light upon the contents of his mind, as does the truly British prejudice

* Mark Pattison, 'Memoirs,' p. 97.

which caused him to be horrified at the sight of ships coaling at Malta 'on a holy day.' His range of ideas was so much restricted that Bremond, a sincere admirer, says that his imagination lived on 'une poignée de souvenirs d'enfant.' How tragic was the fate which caught this loyal Englishman and more than loyal Oxonian in the meshes of a cosmopolitan institution in which England counted for little and Oxford for nothing at all!

The Reform of 1832 seemed to threaten the English Church with destruction. Arnold in this year wrote 'The Church, as it now stands, no human power can save.' The bishops were stunned and bewildered by the unexpected outbreak of popular hostility. Old methods of defence were plainly useless; some new plan of campaign must be devised against the double assault of political radicalism and theological liberalism. To Newman both alike were of the devil; theological liberalism especially was only specious infidelity. He never had the slightest inkling that a deep religious earnestness and love of truth underlay the revolt against orthodox tradition. His fighting instincts were aroused. When Keble attributed the scheme for suppressing some Irish bishopries to 'national apostasy,' he rushed to arms in defence of Church privileges and property. In the first Tract (1833) he says:

> 'A notion has gone abroad that the people can take away your power. They think they have given it and can take it away. They have been deluded into a notion that present palpable usefulness, produceable results, acceptableness to your flocks—that these and such-like are the tests of your Divine commission. Enlighten them in this matter. Exalt our holy fathers the Bishops, as the representatives of the Apostles, and the Angels of the Churches, and magnify your office, as being ordained by them to take part in their ministry.'

That was the keynote of the whole Tractarian movement. A weapon was needed to smite liberalism. Nothing but a compact and powerful organisation could repel the foe. God must have provided such an organisation—a Divine society, certain of ultimate victory, must exist somewhere. Newman and his friends hoped to find it in the Anglican Church; and such was the power of their contagious zeal and confident enthusiasm, that the immediate danger was actually staved off, and the Establishment was allowed a new lease of life. But the national Church of England was not constituted to resist the national will, and the attempt to re-organise it on Catholic lines was foredoomed to failure. And so, since the assumption that a great institutional fighting Church *must*

exist was never even questioned, when Anglicanism failed him there was no other refuge but Rome.

He was certainly more logical than his friends who remained behind. Anglo-Catholicism has its theoretical basis in a definition of Catholicity which is repudiated by all other Catholics; its traditions are largely legendary. But it is an eclectic system well suited to the English character, and the distorted view of history which Newman bequeathed to the party has enabled it to borrow much that is good from different sides, without any sense of inconsistency. The idea of a Divine society has been and is the inspiration of thousands of ardent workers in the Anglican Church. It has lifted the religion of Englishmen from the somewhat gross and bourgeois condition in which the movement found it, to a pure and unworldly idealism. And, unlike most other religious revivals, especially in this country, it has remained remarkably free from unhealthy emotionalism and hysterics. The social atmosphere of Oxford, always alien to mawkish sentiment, penetrated the whole movement, and maintained in it for many years a certain sanity and dignity which, while they doubtless prevented it from spreading widely in the middle class, made the Tractarians respected by men of taste and education. But these influences could not be permanent. The good-will of the Tractarian firm (if we may so express it) has now been acquired by men with very different aims and methods. The movement is visibly beginning to break up; the ablest members of the party are plunging somewhat violently into social reform, while the rank and file in increasing numbers are fluttering round the Roman candle, into which many of them must ultimately fall.

The progress of the movement between 1833 and 1845 was almost entirely in the direction of teaching the clergy to 'magnify their office.' The other part of the scheme, the combat against theological liberalism, fell quite into the background. The main reason for this was that during those strange years the theologians so completely dominated Oxford that liberalism could hardly raise its head, and was despised as well as hated. Only after Newman's secession could the regeneration of the University begin. Then indeed liberalism came in like a flood, though it was a very shallow flood in some cases. This was the day of the self-satisfied young rationalist, 'écarté par une plaisanterie des croyances dont la raison d'un 'Pascal ne réussit pas à se dégager,' as Renan says—an orgy of facile free thought which after a generation was chastised by another clerical reaction.

If Newman could have foreseen the victory of his party in the English Church, he might perhaps have been content to remain in it. We cannot tell. But it is doubtful whether he would have taken Pusey's place as leader of the party. Newman's influence was disturbing and subtly disintegrating to every cause for which he laboured. His startling candour often seemed like treachery. He could not work with others, and broke with nearly all his friends, retaining only his disciples. He confessed himself a bad judge of character. It is doubtful, after all, whether he was much injured by the jealousy and almost instinctive fear which he inspired among the Roman Catholic hierarchy. If he had been allowed to take the place due to his abilities, his character, and his reputation, what could he have done that he was unable to do at Edgbaston? We cannot fancy him plunged in crooked ecclesiastical intrigue, like that *Inglese italianato*, Cardinal Manning. Still less can we fancy him haranguing strikers, and stealing the credit of composing a trade dispute. No doubt he suffered under the sense of injury; but probably he did what was in him to do. If the Roman Church would not use him as a tool, it was probably because he would not have been a good tool. There are some mistakes which that Church seldom makes; it knows how to choose its men.

What will be the verdict of history on the type of Catholicism which Newman represented? He was kept out in the cold by a conservative Pope, and honoured by a liberal Pope. Which was right, from the point of view of Catholic interests and policy? This is perhaps the most important question which the life of Newman raises; for it affects our anticipations of the future even more than our judgements of the past. Is Newman a safe or a possible guide for Catholics in the twentieth century?

Newman was no metaphysician; he confesses it himself. 'My turn of mind,' he says, 'has never led me towards meta-'physics; rather it has been logical, ethical, practical.'* For metaphysics requires an initial act of faith in human reason, and Newman had not this faith. Even in his Anglican days he uttered many astonishing things in contempt of reason. 'What 'is intellect itself (he asks) but a fruit of the Fall, not found in 'paradise or in heaven, more than in little children, and at the 'utmost but tolerated by the Church, and only not incompatible 'with the regenerate mind? . . . Reason is God's gift, but so 'are the passions . . . . Eve was tempted to follow passion

* Stray Essays, p. 94.

'and reason, and she fell.'* 'Faith does not regard degrees of 'evidence.'† 'Faith and humility consist, not in going about 'to prove, but in the outset confiding in the testimony of 'others.' 'The more you set yourself to argue and prove, 'in order to discover truth, the less likely you are to reason 'correctly.'‡ The amazing crudity of this avowed obscurantism is likely to make the orthodox apologist writhe, and to move the rationalist to contemptuous laughter. In this and many other cases, Newman seems to love to caricature himself, and to put his beliefs in that form in which they outrage common sense most completely. We can imagine nothing more calculated to drive a young and ingenuous mind into flippant scepticism than a course of Newman's sermons. The *reductio ad absurdum* of his arguments is not left to the reader to make; it is innocently provided by the preacher.

And yet Newman's central position is not absurd, or only becomes absurd when it is applied to justify belief in gross superstition. He holds that what he calls 'reasoning' deals only with abstractions, and is not the faculty on which we rely in forming 'judgements.' These judgements, to which we give our 'assent,' and by which we regulate our conduct, are affirmations of the basal personality. And these have an authority far greater than can ever arise out of the logical manipulation of concepts. 'There is no ultimate test of 'truth besides the testimony borne to the truth by the mind 'itself.' The 'mind itself,' the concrete personality, is concerned with realities, while the intellect, which for him corresponds very nearly with the discursive reason (*διάνοια*) of the Greek philosophers, is at home only in mathematics and, up to a certain point, in logic. The concepts of the intellect have no existence outside of it. 'The mind has the gift, by 'an act of creation, of bringing before it abstractions and 'generalisations, which have no counterpart, no existence, 'out of it.'§ Parenthetically, we may remark that passages like this show how wide of the truth Mr. Barry is when he speaks of Newman as a 'thorough Alexandrine.' To deny the existence of universals, to regard them as mere creations of the mind, is rank blasphemy to a Platonist; and the Alexandrines were Christian Platonists. No more misleading statement could be made about Newman's philosophy than to associate him with

* Parochial and Plain Sermons, vol. v. p. 112.
† Ibid. vol. vi. p. 259.
‡ Ibid. vol. vi. p. 340.
§ Grammar of Assent, part i. c. 1 and 2.

Platonism of any kind, whether Pagan or Christian. Newman adopts the sensationalist (Lockian) theory of knowledge. Ideas are copies or modifications of the data presented by the senses ; ' first principles are abstractions from facts, not elemen- ' tary truths prior to reasoning.' This is pure nominalism, in its crudest form. It makes all arguments in favour of the great truths of religion valueless : for if there are no universals, rational theism is impossible. It follows that the famous scholastic ' proofs of God's existence ' have for Newman no cogency whatever ; indeed it is difficult to see how he can have escaped condemning the whole philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas as a juggling with bloodless concepts. Newman himself pleaded that he had no wish to oppose the official dogmatics of his Church. But protestations are of no avail where the facts are so clear. ' The natural theology of our schools,' says a writer in the ' Tablet,' quoted by Dr. Caldecott in his ' Philo- ' sophy of Religion,' ' is based frankly and wholly on the appeal ' to reason.' This is notoriously true ; and what Newman thought of reason we have already seen. His extreme dispa- ragement of the intellect seems to preclude what he calls ' real assent ' to the creeds and dogmas of Catholicism ; for these clearly consist of ' notional ' propositions. But Newman would answer that the Church is a concrete fact, to which ' real assent ' can be given ; and the Church has guaranteed the truth of the notional propositions in question. But since reason is put out of court as a witness to truth, on what faculty, or on what evidence, does Newman rely ? Feeling he distrusts ; that side of mysticism, at any rate, finds no sympathy from him. Nor does he, like many Kantians and others, make the will supreme over the other faculties. Rather, as we have seen, he bases his reliance on the verdicts of the undivided personality, which he often calls conscience. This line of apologetic was at this very time being ably developed by Julius Hare. It is in itself an argument which has no necessary connexion with obscuran- tism. ' Personalism,' as it is technically called, reminds us that we do actually base our judgements on grounds which are not purely rational ; that the intellect, in forming concepts, has to be content with an approximate resemblance to concrete reality ; and that the will and feelings have their rights and claims which cannot be ignored in a philosophy of religion. But while it is compatible with a robust faith in the powers of the constructive intellect, personalism is beyond question a self-sufficient, independent, individualistic doctrine. When it is combined with a nominalist theory of knowledge, it naturally suggests that every man may and should live by the creed

which bests suits his idiosyncrasies. Now there was much in Newman's temperament which made him turn in this direction. 'Lead, kindly Light,' has been the favourite hymn of many an independent thinker, to whom the authority of the Church is less than nothing. But on another side Newman was all his life a fierce upholder of the principle of authority. His reason for accepting the dogmas of the Church, and for wishing to destroy heresiarchs like wild beasts, was certainly not that his basal personality testified to the truth and value of all ecclesiastical dogmas. He believed them 'by confiding in 'the testimony of others'—in other words, on the authority of the Catholic Church. If we push back the enquiry one step further, and ask on what grounds he chooses to prefer the authority of the Catholic Church to other authorities, such as natural science or philosophy, we are driven again to lay great stress on the almost political necessity which he felt that such a Divine society should exist. In accepting the authority of the Church, he accepted the authority of all that the Church teaches, in complete independence of human reason. But the Roman Church never professes to be independent of human reason. The official scholastic philosophy claims to be a demonstrative proof of theism.

Newman, then, was only half a Catholic. He accepted with all the fervour of a neophyte the principle of submission to Holy Church. But in place of the official intellectualist apologetic, which an Englishman may study to great advantage in the remarkably able series of manuals issued by the Jesuits of Stonyhurst, he substituted a philosophy of experience which is certainly not Catholic. The authority claimed by the Roman Church rests on one side upon revelation, on the other upon an elaborate structure of demonstrative reasoning, which the simple folk are allowed to 'take as read,' only because they cannot be expected to understand it, but which is declared to be of irresistible cogency to any properly instructed mind. To deny the validity of reasoning upon Divine things is to withdraw one of the supports on which Catholicism rests. Subjectivism, based on vital experience, mixes no better with this system than oil with water. Scholasticism prides itself on clear-cut definitions, on irrefragable logic, on using words always in the same sense. For Newman, as for his disciples the Modernists, theological terms are only symbols for varying values, and he holds that the moment they are treated as having any fixed connotation, error begins. It is no wonder if learned Catholics thought that Newman did not play the game. Father Perrone, in spite of his friendship for the object

of his criticism, declared that 'Newman miscet et confundit 'omnia.'

The accusation of scepticism, which was not unnaturally brought against him, was hotly resented by Newman, and with some justice. Of the intensity of his personal conviction there can be no doubt whatever. Indeed, it was just because his faith was in no danger that he cared so little for any intellectual defence of it. He might have made his own the lines of Wordsworth :

> 'Here then we rest ; not fearing for our creed
> The worst that human reasoning can achieve
> To unsettle or perplex it.'

Wordsworth too, it may be remembered, speaks of 'reason' with hardly more respect than Newman himself as :

> 'The inferior faculty that moulds
> With her minute and speculative pains
> Opinion, ever changing.'

Robert Browning also, especially in his later years, uses anti-intellectualist language equally uncompromising. 'Wholly 'distrust thy reason,' he says in 'La Saisiaz.' Coleridge's distinction between 'understanding' and 'reason,' or Westcott's distinction between 'reason' and 'reasoning,' might have saved these great writers from the appearance, and perhaps more than the appearance, of blaspheming against the highest and most divine faculty of human nature. For the reason is something much higher than logic-chopping ; it can provide, from its own resources, a remedy for the intellectual error which is just now miscalled intellectualism ; it is the activity of the whole personality under the guidance of its highest part ; and because it is a real unification of our disordered nature, it can bring us into real contact with the higher world of Spirit. Newman's scepticism was not doubtfulness about matters of faith ; it was only a wholly unjustifiable contempt and distrust for the unaided activity of the human mind. This activity, as far as he could see, produced only various forms of 'liberalism,' which he strangely enough regarded as a kind of 'scepticism.' Thus he retorted, with equal injustice, the unjust charge brought against himself.

Newman has often been suspected or accused of quibbling and intellectual dishonesty. Kingsley, whose healthy but somewhat rough English morality and common sense were revolted by Newman's whole attitude to life and conduct, was unable to conceive how any educated man could believe

in winking Virgins and liquefying blood and thought that Newman must be dishonest. More recently Dr. Abbott has accused him of being a *philomythus*. Judged by ordinary standards, Newman's criteria of belief do seem incompatible with intellectual honesty. Locke, whom Newman resembles in his theory of knowledge, lays down a canon which condemns absolutely the Cardinal's doctrine of assent. 'There is one 'unerring mark,' he says, 'by which a man may know whether 'he is a lover of truth in earnest, namely, the not entertaining 'any proposition with greater assurance than the proofs 'it is built on will warrant.' Newman himself quotes this dictum, and argues against it that men do, as a matter of fact, form their judgements in a very different fashion. To most people, however, the fact that opinions *are* so manufactured is no proof that they *ought* to be so. To most people it seems plain that the practical necessity of making unverified assumptions, and the habit of clinging to them because we have made them, even after their falsity has been exposed, is a satisfactory explanation of the prevalence of error, but not a reason for acquiescing in it. It is useful, they hold, to point out how assumption has a perilous tendency to pass for proof, not that we may contentedly confuse assumption with proof, but that we may be on our guard against doing so. But such is Newman's dislike of 'reason' that he rejoices to find that the majority of mankind are, in fact, not guided by it. And then, having made this discovery, he is quite ready to 'reason' himself, but not in the manner of an earnest seeker after truth. Reason, for him, is a serviceable weapon of attack or defence, but he is like a man fighting with magic impenetrable armour. He enjoys a bout of logical fence; but it will decide nothing for him: his 'certitude' is independent of it. It is easy to see that such an attitude must appear profoundly dishonest to any man who accepts Locke's maxim about truth-seeking. It is equally easy to see that Newman would spurn the charge of dishonesty as hotly as the charge of scepticism. His principles made it easy for him to adopt the characteristic Catholic habit of 'believing' anything that is pleasing to the religious imagination. His sermons are full of such phrases as 'Scripture *seems* to show us'; 'why should we not be-'lieve . . .'; 'who knows whether . . .,' and the like, all introducing some fantastic superstition. He deliberately accepts the insidious and deadly doctrine that 'no man is 'convinced of a thing who can endure the thought of its con-'tradictory being true.' To which we may rejoin that, on the contrary, no man has a right to be convinced of anything until

he has fairly faced the hypothesis of its contradictory being true. So long as Newman's method prevailed in Europe, every branch of practical knowledge was condemned to barrenness.

For what kind of knowledge is it which is acquired, not by the exercise of the discursive intellect, or by the evidence of our senses, but by the affirmations of our basal personality? Surely the legitimate province of 'personalism' lies in the region of general ideas, or rather in the *Weltanschauung* as a whole. Our undivided personality protests against any philosophy which makes life irrational, or base, or incurably evil. It claims that those pictures of reality which are provided by the intellect, by the aesthetic sense, and by the moral sense, shall all have justice done to them in any attempted synthesis. It rejects materialism, metaphysical dualism, solipsism, and pessimism, on one or other of these grounds. Such a final interpretation of existence as any of these offers leaves out some fundamental and essential factor of experience, and is therefore untenable. If no metaphysical scheme can be constructed which is at once comprehensive and inwardly consistent, personalism insists that we must acknowledge defeat for the time, rather than take refuge in a logical system which may be free from inner contradictions but which does not satisfy the whole man as a living and active spiritual being. This is a sound argument. But it is absurd to suppose that our personality, acting as an undivided whole, can decide whether the institutional Church, or one branch of it, is the Body of Christ and the receptacle of infallible revelation; whether Christ was born at Bethlehem or Nazareth; or whether Nestorius was a heretic. We have no magical sword for cutting these knots, and no miraculous guide to tell us that authority A is to be believed implicitly, while the possibility of authority B being right is not to be entertained even in thought. Newman as usual supplies us with the best weapons against himself. It startles us to find, even in 1852, such a sentence as this: 'Revealed religion furnishes facts to other sciences, which 'those sciences, left to themselves, would never reach. Thus, 'in the science of history, the preservation of our race in Noah's 'ark is an historical fact, which history never would arrive 'at without revelation.' The transition from belief on the purely internal ground of personal assent to belief on the purely external ground of Church authority is certainly abrupt and hard to explain; but Newman makes it habitually, without any consciousness of a *salto mortale*. In the 'Apologia' he even says that the argument from personality is 'one form of 'the argument from authority.' The argument seems to be—

'There is no third alternative besides Catholicism or Rational-'ism. But "personality" will not accept the dictation of 'reason; therefore it must accept the authority of the Church.' It is a strange argument. All through his life he enormously exaggerated the moral and intellectual weight which should be attached to Church tradition. 'Securus judicat orbis terrarum' were the words which rang in his ears at the supreme moment of his great decision. His 'orbis terrarum' was the Latin empire. And when even in those countries the authority of the Pope is rejected, he condemns modern civilisation as an aberration. This however is a complete abandonment of his own test. He first says 'The judgement of the great world is final'; and then 'If the world decides against Rome, so much the worse 'for the world.' After all, Newman had no right to complain if his opponents found his reasoning disingenuous. To make up our mind first, and to argue in favour of the decision afterwards, is in truth to make the reason a hewer of wood and drawer of water to the irrational part of our nature.

It is precisely his sympathy with Catholicism on the religious side, and his alienation from its intellectual method, which makes Newman's apologetic such a two-edged weapon. In attempting to defend Catholicism, he has gone far to explain it. To the historian, there is no great mystery about the growth and success of the Western Catholic Church. Christianity was already a syncretistic religion in the second century. Like the other forms of worship, with which it competed for the popular favour, it contained the necessary elements of mystery-cult, of ethical rule, of social brotherhood, and of personal devotion. But besides many genuine points of superiority, it had a decisive advantage over the religions of Isis and Mithra in the exclusiveness and intolerance which it derived from the Jewish tradition. When the failure of the last persecution forced the Empire to make a concordat with the Church, the transformation of the federated but autonomous Christian communities into a centralised theocratic despotism, claiming secular as well as spiritual sovereignty, was only a matter of time. It was inevitable, just as the principate of Augustus and the sultanate of Diocletian were inevitable; but there is nothing specially divine or glorious about any of these phases of human evolution. The revolt of Northern Europe in the sixteenth century was equally inevitable; and so is the alienation of enlightened minds from the Roman Church at the present day. Newman shows with great force and ingenuity that all the developements in the Roman system which Protestantism rejects as later accretions were natural and necessary. But

this only means that the Catholic Church, in order to live, was compelled to adapt itself to the prevailing conditions of human culture in the countries where it desired to be supreme. The argument, so far as it goes, tells against rather than in favour of any special supernatural character belonging to that institution. And if the 'orbis terrarum,' which once gave its verdict in favour of Latin Catholicism, is now disposed to reverse its decision, how, on Newman's principle, can its right to do so be denied? The true reasons for the strength and vitality which the Roman Church still retains are not difficult to find. Its system possesses an inner consistency, which is dearly purchased by neglecting much that should enter into a large and true view of the world, but which guarantees to those who have once accepted it an untroubled calm and assurance very acceptable to those who have been tossed upon a sea of doubt. It surrounds itself with an impenetrable armour by persuading its adherents that all moral and intellectual scruples, in matters where Holy Church has pronounced its verdict, are suggestions of the Evil One, to be spurned like the prickings of sensuality. It has succeeded, by long experience, in providing satisfaction for nearly all the needs of the average man, and for all the needs of the average woman. In particular, the aesthetic tastes which, in Southern Europe at any rate, are closely connected with religious feeling, are fully catered for; and those superstitions which the majority of mankind still love in their hearts, though they are somewhat ashamed of them, are allowed to luxuriate unchecked. Further, Catholicism encourages and blesses that *esprit de corps* which has produced the brightest triumphs of self-abnegation as well as the darkest crimes of cruel bigotry in human history. A Church which unites these advantages is in no danger of falling into insignificance, even if the best intellect and morality of the age are estranged from it. It may even have a great future as the nucleus of a conservative resistance to the social revolution. It is doubtful whether those who wish to preserve the traditions and civilisation of the past will be able to find anywhere, except in the Latin Church, an organisation sufficiently coherent and universal to provide a rallying ground for defence against the new barbarian invasion—proceeding this time not from the rude nations of the North, but from the crowded alleys of our great towns—which threatens to plunge us into a new Dark Age. The menace of the Red Peril will secure, for a long time to come, the survival of the Black.

But the Roman Catholicism which has a future is probably that of Manning, and not that of Newman. A Church which

depends for its strength and prestige on the iron discipline of a centralised autocracy, and on the fanatical devotion of soldiers who know no duty except obedience, no cause except the interests of their society, can make no terms with the disintegrating nominalism, the uncertain subjectivism, of a mind like Newman's. It has been the strange fate of this great man, after driving a wedge deep into the Anglican Church, which at this day is threatened with disruption through the movement which he helped to originate, to have nearly succeeded in doing the same to the far more compact structure of Roman Catholicism. The Modernist movement has from the first appealed to Newman as its founder, and has sought to protect itself under his authority. It is necessary to consider, as the last topic of this article, whether this affiliation can be allowed to be true. No one who has read any of Newman's works can doubt that he would have recoiled with horror from the destructive criticism of Loisy, the contempt for scholastic authority of Tyrrell, and the defiance hurled at the Papacy in the manifesto of the Italian Modernists. Newman's doctrine of Developement was far removed from that of Bergson's 'L'Evolution Créatrice.' He defended the fact of developement against the staticism of contemporary Anglicanism; but his notion of developement was more like the unrolling of a scroll than the growth of a tree or the expansion and change of a human character. 'Every Catholic holds,' he says, 'that the Christian dogmas 'were in the Church from the time of the Apostles; that they 'were ever in their substance what they are now.' Compare this with Tyrrell's words:

'The visible Church is but a means, a way, a creature, to be used where it helps, to be left where it hinders. Who have taught us that the consensus of theologians cannot err, but the theologians themselves? Mortal, fallible, ignorant men like ourselves. Their present domination is but a passing episode in the Church's history. May not Catholicism, like Judaism, have to die in order that it may live again in a greater and grander form? Has not every organism got its limits of development, after which it must decay and be content to survive in its progeny? Wine-skins stretch, but only within measure; for there comes at last a bursting-point when new ones must be provided.'*

Or compare it with the following words from the Italian manifesto: 'The supernatural life of Christ in the faithful and 'in the Church has been clothed in an historical form, which 'has given birth to what we might somewhat loosely call the

* Tyrrell: 'A Much-abused Letter.'

'Christ of legend. . . . Such a criticism does away with the 'possibility of finding in Christ's ministry even the embryonic 'form of the Church's later theological teaching.' 'A dogma,' says Le Roy, one of the ablest philosophers of the school, 'proclaims, above all, a prescription of practical order; it is 'the formula of a rule of practical conduct. Why then should 'we not bring theory into harmony with practice?'

These extracts mark a much later phase of the revolt against Catholic dogma and scholastic theology than can be found in Newman's writings. They are contemporary with the Pragmatism of James and Schiller, and the Activism of Bergson. So bold a defiance of tradition would have been impossible thirty years earlier. And yet, when Newman pours scorn upon human reason, and when he enthrones the 'conscience' as the supreme arbiter of truth, is he not, in fact, preparing the way for these startling declarations, which imply a complete rupture with Catholic authority? Dogmas are indisputably 'notional' propositions; that is to say, they belong to that class of truths to which Newman ascribes only a very subordinate importance. We cannot, in his sense, 'assent' to an historical proposition as such, but only to the authority which has ordered us to believe it. And is there any justification for Newman's confidence that this authority may make apparent innovations, such as he admits to have been made throughout the history of the Church, but no real changes? If he had been able to think out the implications of his doctrine of developement with the help of such arguments as those of Bergson, would he not have seen that without change and real innovation there can be no true evolution? Do not the fluidity and pragmatic character of dogma, so much insisted on by Sabatier and Le Roy, follow from the anti-intellectualist personalism which we have seen to be the foundation of Newman's philosophy of religion? The Modernist might argue that he is only extending to the history of the Church the doctrine of education by experience which Newman found to be true in the life-history of the individual. Life itself, with its experiences and its needs, is the revealer of truth. We cannot anticipate the wisdom of the future.

> 'I do not ask to see
> The distant scene; one step enough for me.'

The kindly light leads a man on step by step; it conducts him from experience to experience, not without lapses into error; it reproves him if he desires to 'choose and see his path.' If this is true in the history of the

individual, is it not probably also true in the history of the Church? And if it is true in the history of the Church, are not the dogmatists wrong who have tried to legislate not only for the present but the future, and to bind the Church for all time to the formulations which appeared satisfactory to themselves? If Providence is leading the Church through varied experiences in order to teach it greater wisdom, is it not clear that we must not rashly preclude the possibility of future revelation by stereotyping the results of some earlier stage of experience? Thus the empiricism of Newman leads logically to consequences which he would have been among the first to reject.

Some rather shallow thinkers in this country have expressed their surprise and regret that the Vatican has refused to make any terms with Modernism. They have supposed that the fault lies with an ignorant and reactionary Pope. But there are many reasons why this dangerous and disintegrating tendency must be rigorously excluded from Roman Catholicism. In the first place, Modernism destroys the historical basis of Christianity, and converts the Incarnation and Atonement into myths like those of other dying and rising saviour-gods, which hardly pretend to be historical. But it was this foundation in history which helped largely to secure the triumph of Christianity over its rivals. In the place of the historical God-Man, Modernism gives us the history of the Church as an object of reverence. We are bidden to contemplate an institution of amazingly tough vitality but great adaptability, which in its determination to survive has not only changed colour like a chameleon but has from time to time put forth new organs and discovered new weapons of offence and defence. We ask for evidence that the Church has regenerated the world; and we are shown how, by hook or by crook, it has succeeded in safeguarding its own interests. Ecclesiastical historians are ingenious and unscrupulous; but it is impossible even for them to exhibit Church history as the record of a continuous intervention of the Spirit of Christ in human affairs. If any Spirit has presided over the councils of popes, cardinals, and inquisitors it is not that of the Founder of Christianity.

Further, the religious philosophy of Modernism is bad, much worse than the scholasticism which it derides. It is in essentials a revival of the sophistry of Protagoras. And if it were metaphysically more respectable than it is, it is so widely opposed to the whole system of Catholic apologetics, that if it were accepted, it would necessitate a complete reconstruction of Catholic dogma. Let any man read the Stonyhurst manuals, and say whether the radical empiricism of the Modernists could

find a lodgement anywhere in such a system without disturbing the stability of the whole. Catholicism is one of the most compact structures in the world, and it rests on presuppositions which are far removed from those of Modernism. It is one thing to admit that dogmas in many cases have a pragmatic origin, and quite another to say that they may be invented or rejected with a pragmatic purpose. The healthy human intellect will never believe that the same proposition may be true for faith and untrue in fact; but this is the Modernist contention.

Lastly, the subjectivism of Newman and the Modernists is fatal to that exclusiveness which is the corner-stone of Catholic policy. The analogy between the individual and the Church suggests that God may 'fulfil Himself in many ways, lest one 'good custom should corrupt the world.' As there are many individuals, each of whom is being guided separately by the 'kindly light,' so there may be many churches. The pragmatic proof of the truth of a religion, from the fact of its survival and successful working, does not justify the Roman claim to monopoly. The Protestant churches also display vitality, and their members seem to exhibit the fruits of the Spirit. The condemnations of Modernism published by the Vatican show that the Papal court is quite alive to this danger. To the outsider, indeed, it might seem a happy solution of a long controversy if the Roman Church would be content to claim the gifts of grace which are really hers, without denying the validity of the Orders and Sacraments of other bodies, and the genuineness of the Christian graces which they exhibit. It would then be admitted on all hands that some temperaments are more suited to Catholicism, others to Protestantism, and that the character of each man developes most satisfactorily under the discipline which suits his nature. But we must not expect any such concession from Rome; and in truth such an admission would be the beginning of the end for Catholicism in its present form.

Our conclusion then is that although Newman was not a Modernist, but an exceedingly stiff conservative, he did introduce into the Roman Church a very dangerous and essentially alien habit of thought, which has since developed into Modernism. Perhaps Monsignor Talbot was not far wrong, from his own point of view, when he called him 'the most dangerous 'man in England.' One side of his religion was based on principles which, when logically drawn out, must lead away from Catholicism in the direction of an individualistic religion of experience, and a substitution of history for dogma which

makes all truth relative and all values fluid. Newman's writings have always made genuine Catholics uneasy, though they hardly know why. It is probable that here is the solution.

The character of Newman—for with this we must end—may seem to have been more admirable than lovable. He was more apt to make disciples than friends. Yet he was loved and honoured by men whose love is an honour, and he is admired by all who can appreciate a consistently unworldly life. The Roman Church has been less unpopular in England since Newman received from it the highest honour which it can bestow. Throughout his career he was a steadfast witness against tepid and insincere professions of religion, and against any compromise with the shifting currents of popular opinion. All cultivated readers, who have formed their tastes on the masterpieces of good literature, are attracted, sometimes against their will, by the dignity and reserve of his style, qualities which belong to the man, and not only to the writer. Like Goethe, he disdains the facile arts which make the commonplace reader laugh and weep. 'Ach die zärtlichen Herzen! ein Pfuscher 'vermag sie zu rühren!' Like Wordsworth, he might say 'To 'stir the blood I have no cunning art.' There are no cheap effects in any of Newman's writings. He is the most undemocratic of teachers. Such men do what can be done to save a nation from itself, its natural enemy. They are not indifferent to fame, because they desire influence; but they will do nothing to advertise themselves. The public must come to them; they will not go to the public. There have been other great men who have been as indifferent as Newman to the applause of the vulgar. But they have been generally either pure intellectualists or pure artists, in whom

> 'The intellectual power through words and things
> Went sounding on a dim and perilous way.'

Newman's 'confidence towards God' was of a still nobler kind. It rested on an unclouded faith in the Divine guidance, and on a very just estimate of the worthlessness of contemporary praise and blame. There have been very few men who have been able to combine so strong a faith with a thorough distrust of both discursive reasoning and emotional excitement, and who, while denying themselves these aids to conviction, have been able to say, calmly and without petulance, that with them it is a very small thing to be judged of man's judgement.

'What,' he asks, 'can increase their peace who believe and trust in the Son of God? Shall we add a drop to the ocean, or grains to the sand of the sea? We pay indeed our superiors full reverence,

and with cheerfulness as unto the Lord; and we honour eminent talents as deserving admiration and reward; and the more readily act we thus, because these are little things to pay.'*

Such unworldliness as this, in the well-chosen words of R. H. Hutton, 'stands out in strange and almost majestic contrast 'to the eager turmoil of confused passions, hesitating ideals, 'tentative virtues, and groping philanthropies, amidst which it 'was lived.'

Another mark of greatness is unbroken consistency and unity of aim in a long life. There are few parallels to the neglect of his own literary reputation by Newman. Higher interests, he thought, were at stake; and so he had no dream of building for himself 'a monument more durable than brass,' and of claiming a pedestal among the great writers of English prose and verse. He accepted long years of literary barrenness; he wrote historical essays for which he had no special aptitude, and dogmatic disquisitions which even his genius could not save from dulness; he even descended into mere journalism. The 'Apologia' would probably not have been written but for the accident of Kingsley's attack. It has, no doubt, been said with truth that Newman showed great dexterity in choosing opponents with whom to cross swords—Kingsley, Pusey, Gladstone, and his old Anglican self. But this does not alter the fact that a man who must have been conscious of rare literary gifts made no attempt to immortalise himself by them. It was for the Church, and not for himself, that he wrote as well as lived.

That his life is for the most part a record of sadness and failure is no indication that he was not one of the great men of his time. Independence is no passport to success in a world where, as Swift said, climbing and crawling are performed in much the same attitude. And if we are right in our view that there was something in the composition of his mind which prevented him from being either a complete Catholic or a complete Protestant, this too is no obstacle to our recognition of his greatness. He has left an indelible mark upon two great religious bodies. He has stirred movements which still agitate the Church of England and the Church of Rome, and the end of which is not yet in sight. Anglo-Catholicism and Modernism are alien growths, perhaps, in the institutions where they have found a place; but the man who beyond all others is responsible for grafting them upon the old stems is secure of his place in history.

* Parochial and Plain Sermons, vol. vii. p. 73.

Art. II.—THE HOUSE OF HEROD IN HISTORY AND ART.

1. *The Antiquities of the Jews.* By Flavius Josephus, A.D. 93. Translated by W. Whiston. 1814.
2. *Atta Troll, ein Sommernachts Traum.* Caput xviii-xx. By H. Heine. 1847.
3. *Hérodias* (*Trois Contes*). By Gustave Flaubert. Paris. 1877.
4. *Gustave Moreau.* By Ary Renan. Paris. 1900.
5. *Salomé.* By Oscar Wilde. London: Melmoth and Co 1904.

'Herodias . . . was married to Herod (Philip) the son of Herod the Great, who was born of Mariamne, the daughter of Simon the High Priest, who had a daughter Salome; after whose birth, Herodias took upon her to confound the laws of our country, and divorced herself from her husband, while he was alive, and was married to Herod (Antipas), her husband's brother by the father's side.'*

So, in an obscure passage of the old Jewish chronicler, the daughter of Herodias, whose figure has focussed the imaginations of artists, painters, poets, from century to century, enters the scene of history amid a genealogical medley of names wherein the generations of the House of Herod are confusedly enumerated until the tables of affinity remain as riddles in a maze of descents no man may with any certainty interpret.

For remembrance one shall be taken and another left, and in the taking Fate plays her game of colin-maillard. Out of all goats she chooses one for the scapegoat—the type-sinner of his kind. Out of all men who have struck with the sword, Cain has been elected as the initial murderer. Out of all women who have given their souls and bodies to corruption, Jezebel's name has become the immortal byword. Out of all traitors the lot fell upon Iscariot to impersonate perpetually the title-rôle of the betrayer. In a lesser measure out of the myriad odalisques who danced before voluptuous Eastern kings, one Herodian princess, grand-daughter of that greater Salome who dwelt in older days as the evil genius

* The Works of Flavius Josephus. Translated by William Whiston. Edinburgh, 1814. Vol. iii. book 18, chap. v.

of her brother's palaces, won the long infamy of her triumphant grace.

It is not by any superlative gift of vice, virtue or genius that renown clings to one saint or sinner and that oblivion accrues to another. Salome, daughter of Herodias, was of no greater account, one may conjecture from the solitary reference to her existence found in Josephus's annals, than any other of the large company of Herodian women who, from Cipros, mother of the first Herod, to Bernice, sister of the last, flitted for more than a century like gorgeous twilight birds of pleasure and prey across the shifting panorama of brilliantly tinted Eastern life. She but drew the lot which marked her, as many another before, for an unconscious agent in her own celebrity. Thus it is, and not seldom, that a life of no intrinsic interest wanders along the vast highway of the world's history. One amongst a million kindred wayfarers it may slip unheeded out of sight, a face lost to view amongst a million faces, a footfall lost to hearing in the tramp of that immense anonymous and forgotten multitude who tread for ever in continuous procession the dusty road of time and death. Or it may chance the decree has ordained otherwise. The car of some weighty drama, in whose enacting world-issues are at stake, whirls by; the small life is caught in the wheel, it is carried along, to be cast at length upon some high platform where the chief players, on whom the eyes of posterity are set, enact their parts. The small life, unaware of the momentous happenings, participates in the action, it becomes enmeshed, entangled, in the plot, it contributes blindfold to the march of events freighted heavily with the destinies of humanity. Henceforth that life, howsoever trivial in itself, is magnified to the vision of ages to come. The face it might have worn is re-imaged, the voice, none would have heeded in the press, is re-echoed, and round that inconspicuous figure strange imaginations weave fantastic legends and transmit them from generation to generation, to the children of children unborn, in wandering folk-tales or written tradition.

After some such manner for us of the West—over whom the ancient East, with its phantasmagoria of colour, its feverish languor, its mysterious splendour, has cast its enigmatical spell—for us of the West the memory of that Salome of legend and tradition, of that birthday feast, of the princess who danced before a king, and of a prophet slain, survives.

Apart from its place in Christian story there was nothing to distinguish the episode related in the Gospel narrative

and reiterated in Christian iconography from many an incident recorded by Josephus. Throughout his prosaic and diffuse pages, he tells again and again of the clash of passion where women, royal and unroyal, Jew or non-Jew, roused the fierce loves, jealousies, and animosities of that Idumean race who from the time of Herod the Great's ascendancy to the fall of Jerusalem held sway over the narrow strip of land (some 140 miles in length) that lies between the deepest chasm of the Jordan valley, with its mountain-wall, and the Mediterranean waters. And only by virtue of its place in Christian story does the scene, preserved by decades of vivid presentments, stand out from amongst the accumulated catastrophes of the House of Herod.

The conception of doomed Houses—Houses of Tantalus—belongs to all countries and times, and has imprinted itself upon literature. A belief in outraged supernatural powers, their actions manifest in calamities; a fundamental belief in supernatural powers whose formulated will became fate, lay at its root, and lies still maybe at the root of many a folk-lore tale of hereditary curses and of the misfortunes that dog, with the mute persistence of Nemesis, the descendants, guilty or guiltless, of some unhappy family. And the House of Herod, as Josephus unravels the thread of its destiny during the century and a quarter when the Herodian dynasty held rule in the land of Israel, stands foremost as one marked for doom. Nor can the prolix pages of genealogical and historical detail, the vainglorious divagations of the Hebrew chronicler of the Chosen People, lessen the impression, the tragic sense, of sinister gloom that overshadows alike the regal magnificence of the great Herod's triumphs and the ultimate extinction of a family risen from private to royal estate, swayed by the extravagance of its passions, crushed under the ruins of its ambitions, and whose story ends with the career of a Herod, apostate to the traditions of his race, fighting in the legions of Roman conquerors whose hands desecrated the holy city and laid the walls of Zion level with the ground.

In that picture of chaos, a chaos savage, sensual, barbarous, and luxurious of semi-civilised orientalism, the figure of Herod the Great towers. Something of an apocryphal Titan, something of medieval monstrosity, somewhat of the large heroism of Scandinavian sagas, clings to the legend of his deeds and misdeeds. Touch by touch, with no least trace of conscious endeavour, the image of the Idumean—the 'half-Jew'—stands out from amongst the throngs of soldiers and potentates and

adventurers, Parthians and Arabians and Romans, who crowd the unquiet Syrian stage where battles, intrigues, sieges, insurrections, follow one another in bewildering succession of kaleidoscopic change, and where, like a living being, a potent, sentient being radiating force, the Temple rises for ever in the background, throwing the shadows of divine dominion over the land men struggled, suffered, sinned, and lusted to possess.

In youth he emerges from the crowd—son of the Idumean Procurator of Judea, Antipater, and of Cipros his wife. A boy of fifteen * he governed in Galilee and grew to manhood with all the arrogance of sovereignty. Charged with murder, summoned before the Sanhedrim, he answered the summons. His guards attending him, he came, clothed not in the sackcloth, the ash-sprinkled garb of penitence, but clad in purple, his hair, the black hair he prized with human vanity in old age, trimmed. The Sanhedrim, his accusers themselves, sat silent, 'he affrighted them all'—all save one, the righteous man Sameas who boldly upbraided those timorous judges and with fearless words confronted the unashamed criminal. And it is written that, in days to come when Herod slew all those elders, to Sameas he granted life for that he had him in honour. It is one trait, and not a single instance, of the spirit of generous chivalry which, as Herod passed from youth to age, disappeared from the story of the despot whose magnanimity had once been as lavish as his barbarities were unrelenting.

But imperial insolence was linked with oriental statecraft. The story of vengeance taken for his father's murder is typical. With dissimulation Herod accepted the denial of the murderer. Then, carrying gold and garlands to the Roman general, he courted his friendship and, betaking himself to Tyre, where the traitor dwelt, he made a great feast. The feast ended, the Roman revellers went forth. Upon the sea-shore they met the man they sought; he fell, stabbed by many daggers. Herod's vengeance thus accomplished by Roman hands, he journeyed with bribes to find Mark Antony. And Antony, fresh from his first meeting with Egypt's queen, 'who brought 'him to fall in love with her,' made Herod tetrarch in Judea, where the ancient Asmonean dynasty had reigned.

In a second stage of his career he is seen flying from the Parthian host. His wife, Doris, an Idumean, mother of his firstborn son, Mariamne, the royal grand-daughter of the high priest Hyrcanus (of the race of the Asmoneans), to whom

* An alternative reading makes him older.

he was espoused, and Cipros his mother were with him, and amongst the fugitives was his sister the elder Salome, whose undying rivalry with the Asmonean princess underlay the long tragedy of Herod's home. Hers was the hand which for ever pointed to blood-shedding, hers the whisper which filled the cup with venom and sharpened the knife to slay. And she it was who stood out in bold relief as the unflagging instigator of evil deeds amid those women whose beauty wakened the tiger passions of a race where Eastern savagery mingled with Western corruptions. But in those earlier days, a common misfortune held all the Herodian household in its grasp. Herod, always a prey to alternating moods, was first of good courage, and comforted his companions on that perilous journey. Then on a sudden, seeing the wagon where Cipros sat overthrown and her in danger, he drew his sword and would have slain himself had not those about restrained him from seeking death on that wise.*

Vehement in his affections as he was extravagant in passions those episodes prelude future events. In vain, made king by Antony's decree, he arrogated to himself imperial dignities, the burthen and scorn of his birth was a canker eating at his heart. In vain a Babylonian myth was woven about the origin of his race; the very pariahs of the hills taunted him. The old cave-dweller, whose companion robbers were drawn with iron hooks from their holes in the precipices of the mountains, cast it in his teeth. An old man was caught with seven children . . . those (for Herod proffered pardon to such as yielded themselves up) prayed of their father leave to surrender. But the old man stood at the cave-mouth and he slew each of his sons as he passed forth. And he made mock of Herod's mean descent, and although Herod stretched out his hand and offered him life, he cast himself over the precipice.† True, the terrors of kingship encompassed his presence. One evening, bathing after battle in an inner chamber of a house, three fugitives who had hidden themselves there from the swords of Herod's soldiers issued out from their hiding place. The first came, his naked sword in his hand, saw the king, passed by and went out at the door. A second, a third, followed, but so great was their awe that not any one of those three dared strike him whom it was in their hands to slay. Nevertheless no exploits of warriordom, no magnificence of

* Josephus, book xiv. chap. xiii.

† Book xiv. chap. xv.

state, no marble wonders of palaces, no terrors of his ruthless ferocity, no glories in days to come of his newly built Temple, no diadem of Antony's bestowing, could remove the stigma of his blood, nor could his marriage with Mariamne, wise in council, righteous in deed and beautiful above all others, eradicate from the heart of Israel the national desire for a ruler of pure Jewish parentage.

A siege of Jerusalem followed his marriage. Jew fought against Jew, Herod the half-Jew with his Roman allies against Antigonus of the ancient dynasty which for 126 years had reigned in Syria. Herod triumphed, yet over his triumph fell a cloud of dread. Amid the slaughter, which he strove in vain to check, the Temple itself was menaced with desecration. With its veils, its mysteries, its golden table and sacred candlesticks, its cups of silver and the altars where patient, mild-eyed bulls, with gilded horns, were led to sacrifice, with its cistern of gold sculpted with leaves of convolvulus and tendrils of vine, and its cistern of silver, more polished than any mirror, the House of God stood defenceless, and the king of the House of Herod trembled: to Herod victory seemed a worse calamity than defeat if so be that in their madness the Roman victors should penetrate those shut doors and see aught that it was not lawful for any but the priest to see.

Herod's triumph was accomplished. With his triumph, with the consummation of his marriage to Mariamne, in the idolatry of his passion for the woman he was to slay, the shadows of his life-tragedy closed around the figure of the king. Crime dogged crime in the annals of his love and misery set its seal upon the parchment.

Hyrcanus, the Asmonean, had been recalled by Herod from exile in Babylon, although a high priest of obscure origin was installed in his office. It would not seem that Hyrcanus desired any reinstatement in his old dignity, but Alexandra, his daughter, the mother of Mariamne, had a son, like his sister, of memorable beauty, and for him, although a child in years, Alexandra claimed the priesthood. Her methods towards the attainment of her end were devious. She entreated Cleopatra's support, despatching a letter by a 'musician' to the queen. She also had portraits of both Mariamne and the boy painted and sent to Antony. Antony made reply, inviting Herod to place the youth under his tutelage. To this demand Herod would in no wise consent, he had no mind that Mariamne's brother should be fostered in that centre of depravity. Therefore Herod deposed the high priest he had appointed, gave the office to the youth, and

made answer to Antony that were he to send the young high priest out of the land of Judea the Jews would rise in insurrection. This being done, Alexandra was well content. Her joy was, however, brief. Jealousy of the Asmonean blood smouldered in Herod's brain. When the Feast of Tabernacles was come the boy went up to offer duly the harvest sacrifices while the Temple was green with the boughs of palms and citron trees as in the days when his royal ancestor, Alexander, was 'pelted' with yellow fruit from the branches the people carried. The worshipping crowd saw that the boy, ministering for the first time at the festival, was tall and fair, and they broke into acclamations. The fire that smouldered in Herod's brain burnt hot. The festival ended, the young priest went from the Temple. In the garden of Herod's palace at Jericho he was at play, 'being but a child.' The day had been hot, the garden was lonely, and the dusk fell by the fish-ponds as the young men of Herod's household cooled themselves in the water. And the boy swam with them in the fish-pools. Then in the darkness the young men dragged him under the water; they made as if it were in jest, and in the gardens of the palace at Jericho, the child was drowned. Again Alexandra appealed to Cleopatra, and, Cleopatra's pity urging him thereto, Antony summoned Herod to account. Herod obeyed the summons. Departing he left command that if he returned not Mariamne should not be suffered to survive him, 'so great 'was the love he bore her.' This Mariamne learnt from Joseph, Salome's husband, to whose guardianship the king had entrusted her. Herod returned but Joseph died, for Cipros the king's mother and Salome, his sister, had brought accusation against Joseph that he was Mariamne's lover and this they did because the Asmonean princess despised those women of baser blood. Nor would Herod in his rage have spared his wife had he not feared that outliving her great would be his remorse. Next upon the roll-call of victims was the mild old Hyrcanus. He too was offered up to appease the fears of the new dynasty. Antony died and Herod must perforce quit Judea to visit Octavius. During this second absence Mariamne was left in the custody of two of Herod's most trusted friends; the same injunction was laid upon them which had been laid on Joseph—that should Herod die, her life should be sacrificed. Watched, imprisoned, menaced, Mariamne's love turned to hatred; when Herod came again into her presence her anger was manifest. Herod's idolatry, half madness and half passion, tortured him into

frenzy, while dread of sorrow which might supervene still held him from slaying the woman who fearlessly defied his wrath. Salome resumed her calumnies; again the queen's guardian suffered death, and finally Mariamne herself was led to execution, 'the colour of her face unchanged and with an unshaken mind,' as beseemed her high descent. On Herod the penalty of his fury wreaked immediate vengeance; the king was beside himself, with unhinged reason he would call for the dead woman to come to him and bid his servants go seek her in the women's chambers, and in that madness he well-nigh died.

The roll-call of victims grew. The mother of Mariamne, Alexandra, followed her two children to the grave. The closest of Herod's friends fell by the hands of the executioners. But everywhere throughout the land his restless, potent vitality left its mark. Theatres and amphitheatres arose, in defiance of Jewish customs, with chariot races and wrestlers and shows where wild beasts and men fought for the delight of spectators. Temples to God and Temples to Caesar, citadels, palaces, cities and harbours where great ships might anchor he built also, and the Temple of Jerusalem he rebuilt with lavish splendour. And the place Mariamne had left vacant was refilled, for Simon, a citizen of Jerusalem, had a daughter fairer than any other woman, and Simon was lifted to the high priesthood and the second Mariamne, his daughter, reigned in the first Mariamne's stead.

So the story of Herod's rule lengthens. Aristobulus and Alexander, the two sons of the first Mariamne, grew to manhood. The elder, Aristobulus, had to wife Salome's daughter, Bernice —to them Herodias, with her double heritage of beauty and passion and pride and guile, was born. The beauty of their mother had descended to the two brothers, her doom likewise overshadowed their fates. Between the brothers and their father's sister, still all-powerful for ill, lay the memory of their mother, slain by her slanders. Salome hated the brothers with bitter enmity. For their humiliation, she wrought on Herod to advance his firstborn son, Antipater, son of the Idumean Doris. And with calumnies the poison seed of suspicion was sown in Herod's mind, until he impeached the two children of his love before the throne of Caesar. Torn between a fierce affection and a fiercer jealousy, the trial scene proceeded as Herod summed up the offences of the two youths, whose lives hung in the trembling balance; until, with a revulsion of passion, he clasped them in his arms, craving for the loves he trampled into hatred. Henceforth the record is drowned in blood. In the royal household murders,

tortures, plots, succeeded one another in the golden-furnished palaces, where Salome, as a dark genius, haunted the old king's steps. Men, says Josephus, became as wild beasts, under that red terror, while Herod, with dyed hair and purple raiment, fought his battle with age and sin and death. Mariamne's sons, foredoomed, Alexander tall and fair, and Aristobulus, father of Herodias, were strangled in prison. Herod remained 'haunted with furies.' His dying, with its scenes of madness and craft, as a loathsome malady held in its grasp the king whose palaces had become slaughter-houses and whose halls were torture-chambers, was the culminating point of that long drama of violence. The principal men of all the great families of Israel were guarded in the Hippodrome of Jericho, while the old king agonized in the palace. The secret sentence had gone forth that they should be shot with darts when he, their king, enters the darkness, so, alone, shall he secure that final pomp—'a great mourning' at his funeral.

Hours passed. Antipater lay in prison, fallen under the old man's displeasure. Without, in the gardens, were the fish ponds where the young high priest met his death at play amongst the king's servants in the dusk of a past day. Stretched on his couch Herod pared an apple. On a sudden he turned the knife against himself. A cry went through the palace. His eldest born heard in his prison. Hope stirred in his heart, and he tampered with his jailor. But Herod yet lived. The report reached the moribund king that the captive had sought escape. 'Beating his head,' Herod issued one last death sentence, and Antipater shared the fate of those two brothers whom he had supplanted.

For five days Herod survived his son's execution. Then on a purple bed, robed in purple, a diadem and a crown upon his head, he was carried on a golden bier and buried in Herodium, the city which he had built.

'Nul roi a tué son successeur.' Since Antony had created Herod king, thirty-seven years had come and gone. Of Herod's nine sons three had died by their father's decree. Three of those living claimed division of his kingdom amid insurrections and impostures. Out of the chaos the rule of Herod-Antipas, son of Malthace, a Samaritan, was established in Perea and Galilee. To Herod-Philip (son of the unroyal Mariamne), the husband of Herodias, Caesar assigned Trachonites, while Salome received, flourishing as a baytree, a royal habitation, three cities, and five hundred thousand [drachmae] of coined silver.

Herod (Herod-Antipas) of the Baptist's martyrdom entered upon his dominion, and again it is a woman's figure which shadowed the destiny of this, the second generation, of the Herodian dynasty.

Herod-Philip with Herodias, also Herod-Agrippa, the brother of Herodias,* like many other Jews of wealth and rank, appear to have had their dwelling in Rome at a certain time when Herod-Antipas visited the city. Then it was that, seeing Herodias, Antipas became the slave of his passion, even as Herod the Great's brother had been a thrall to his love for a baseborn servant, to the rejecting of the king's own daughter; even as the great Herod, hearing how men called the mother of Herod-Philip the fairest woman in Jerusalem, had, 'not 'suffering his reason to hinder him from living as he pleased,' made the daughter of Simon queen in his slain wife's stead. The Herodian passions were swift of birth; under their sway king and tetrarch were pawns in the hand of those who played the game of crowns. The women of the House of Herod knew their power, Herodias made conditions for her love. The wife of Antipas, the Arabian princess over the sea, must go; Herodias would reign alone in her new husband's palaces. Herod agreed, and the Arabian princess went forth from Judea and returned to her father's land. A fierce war revenged the insult offered to her royalty. Nor were the Arabian hordes the only peril that menaced the new tetrarch and the partner of his guilt. The Baptist denounced the adulterous marriage and, according to Josephus, Herod, 'out of 'his suspicious temper,' sent John a prisoner to Macherus. And to Macherus, the palace-citadel by the Dead Sea, Herodias brought Salome, the child of the husband whom she had repudiated.

From Rome to Judea was from the world of swift action and short memories to the land of long tradition and slow change. The East is not as the West nor the West as the East. In the East habits, customs, thoughts, are of long abiding and take little heed of time that passes. The past in a greater measure than elsewhere is the key of history, the interpreter of present deeds: it is the anvil on which things to be are forged. Herodias re-entered that past amid the lusts and depravities that surged throughout the land of milk and honey; she set her feet in the blood-wet labyrinth of treasons trodden by the Herodian kindred, herself a Herod of the third generation. In her veins, diluted by

* Afterwards Herod-Agrippa I.

Idumean heritage, ran the blood of the royal Mariamne whose supreme beauty, through long years of frenzied love and jealousy, had held captive the heart of the great Herod, even as Herodias, courageous, scheming, and corrupt, enthralled to his undoing the soul of Herod's son, the Tetrarch of Galilee. Salome, her child, (tradition takes up the tale at the point where history and fiction meet in Herodian annals *) in her generation retained the gift of that subjugating loveliness. With it she inherited the relentless lust of vengeance, and the episode which has branded her remembrance upon the imagination of the centuries, fits, aptly, into the framework legend and history supply.

Salome's is not the only woman's figure with for accessory the grim burthen of a human head which has passed into the records of Israelite history. Antedating the probable epoch of Salome's birth, if conjecture approximate to truth, some hundred or more years, the legend of Judith had taken form. The story—rumour, fact or fiction—is told in the apocryphal book bearing the name of the Hebrew heroine who took upon herself the adventure of divine revenge.

Since the day in barley harvest when Judith's husband, as he watched them who bound the sheaves, was stricken with the sun, fell, died, and was buried, Judith had fasted, clothed in mourning garb. Then to her ears came the cry of men and women fainting for water in the streets of Bethulia, for the cisterns within the gates were dry, and Holofernes, captain of the Assyrian hosts, was encamped without. And Judith said: 'I will do a thing that shall go throughout all generations 'to the children of our nation. . . .' She anointed herself with precious ointments and put on garments of gladness and braided the hair of her head; she took sandals upon her feet, and put about her, bracelets, and her chains, her rings, and her earrings, and all her ornaments, and decked herself bravely, to allure the eyes of all men that should see her. Thus in her beauty she passed through the gate of Bethulia and down the mountain slopes and through the valley and sought a passport to the tent of the Assyrian conqueror. A hundred men of the first watch of the Assyrians went with her and brought her to the tent of Holofernes, for she made fair promises to deliver over the beleaguered city into his hands. Holofernes, hearing report of her exceeding loveliness, rose

* Even the approximate age of Herodias' daughter—one of four children born to her before her marriage with Antipater—remains uncertain.

from his bed under its canopy woven with purple and gold and emeralds, and he came forth to meet her with silver lamps going before him. For three days she abode in the Assyrian camp, with honour. The fourth day Holofernes made a feast, and bade her to it. She came, and her maid laid soft skins upon the ground that she might sit thereon and eat. And when she sat beside him the heart of the Assyrian captain was ravished, even as the heart of Herod was to stir within him at his birthday banquet of Macherus. And Holofernes, looking upon the beauty of Judith, outbid those proffers of great reward that Herod would one day make to Salome; the Idumean king offered to the dancer half a kingdom, for the grace of Judith the Syrian warrior would have bartered even his God: 'Thy God,' said Holofernes to Judith, 'shall be my God, and thou shalt be renowned through 'the whole earth.' The feast being ended and the guests departed, Judith, alone in his tent beside the wine-drunken sleeper, accomplished the vow she had vowed. From the pillar of the bed she took the sword, and with her own hands she severed the head from the body where Holofernes lay and gave it to her woman. They went forth, as in the famous Uffizi Botticelli, as in picture after picture of Renaissance art, triumphant and rejoicing, to recross the valley and climb the hill, returning unscathed from the doing of the deed, to the city of Bethulia. And the people were glad at her coming, and the women 'made a dance for her . . . and she 'went before all the people in the dance.'

Whatever may be the foundation of the apocryphal chapters which purport to tell the ancient tale, who shall say that it was not a wandering legend in the East when the Baptist raised his voice to denounce the iniquities of Herodias? Who shall say that the daughter of Herodias, in the Galilean palaces, did not listen to the tale, told, maybe, by devout Hebrew waiting women, of that savage trophy carried across the plain of Esdraelon? Who shall say that on the pattern of that woman who had put on garments of gladness, her bracelets and her rings, and decked herself to allure the eyes of men, that she might avenge the shame of her nation, Herodias herself did not mould her scheme of vengeance upon the prophet who had put her royal dignity to shame?

A political significance is assigned by Josephus to the Baptist's martyrdom: 'Herod, who feared lest the great 'influence John had over the people might put it into his 'power to raise a rebellion . . . thought it best, by putting 'him to death, to prevent any mischief he might cause. . . .'

In the Gospel narratives Herodias is made responsible for the crime; Salome is her delegate. They only lift the curtain when the daughter of Herodias makes her entrance as the agent of death; they lift it abruptly and drop it as abruptly and with no commentary, when the deed—for the doing of which alone the evangelists perpetuated Salome's memory—was accomplished.

It is anonymously that she enters the Gospel scene, it is anonymously that she quits it. The personality of the instrument in that crime of lèse-saintship is significantly ignored. The Salome of the Gospel is a tool, it was left to the centuries to come to evolve a character. The Gospel record is brief. Herod made a birthday feast. The nameless daughter of Herodias danced before him. The dialogue is concise: 'Ask me 'whatsoever thou wilt.' Salome seeks Herodias: 'What shall 'I ask?' Herodias, true child of her fierce race, answers 'The head of John the Baptist.' Salome came straightway, with haste, to Herod: 'I will that thou give me the head 'of John the Baptist.' Faithless to the wife of his love, faithless to his half-brother, even to seducing his wife, to his spoken promise the tetrarch is chained. The deed is done, the saint is slain. The guerdon demanded is given: the executioner 'gave it to the damsel and the damsel gave it to her mother,' and of Salome, the child of evil, the gospellers have no more to tell. But henceforth the figure of the birthday dancer stands outlined in that graphic side-scene of the great Mystery Play of Redemption, a factor in the fulfilment of divine destinies. And henceforth, also, in sacred iconography as in secular legend, Salome dances for ever in the imagination of the centuries and for ever in the background of the stage the sword is upraised in the executioner's hand and the blood of a martyrdom flows red on the marble of a palace floor.

> 'Before the nations thou art dancing still
> Up to the winecup! Holy life was spilt
> And thy fair girlhood served a murderous will.
> And so thou fillest up the historic page
> With the keen Scribe and ruthless Pharisee,
> And linked with all the furies of the age,
> Hast found no pitying heart to plead for thee;
> For, lo! thy dancing dress is bloody-red,
> And thy young hands have borne John Baptist's Head.'

So Charles Turner [Tennyson], the lover of country lanes, children's faces, wild-bird songs, and home fields, wrote some forty years ago, paying the one and only tribute of charity ever offered to Salome's ill-fame.

II.

With Salome, history laid down the pen only that art might take it up. No one individual personality of all the Herodian race has attracted to itself during so many centuries the interest and curiosity of artists and poets, men of widely varying temperaments and of divers nationalities. From generation to generation new showmen set new slides in the magic lantern which threw the spectacle of revelry and death upon the sheet of art; the daughter of Herodias appeared age by age in some new guise. Remote medievalism presented her on the painted glass of Gothic churches or in the illuminated page of sacred manuscript as a grotesque contortionist, exhibiting a mountebank's tricks. According to some obsolete reading of Scriptural phrase she performs what old John Florio defines —in her case with apt effect—as a '*salto mortale*: the somberssult, the deadly leape.' Under which designation indeed the fathers of the Church would willingly have included every exhibition of the corybantic art, pronouncing each and all of its branches in Salome's name anathema: 'Christians,' said Chrysostom, with wide sweep of damnatory clauses, 'do not sacrifice half a kingdom nor a man's life at a dancer's 'behest, but their own souls do they deliver to destruction.' But the fathers were canonised and the Puritans yet unborn when the *salto mortale* of the princess at the Herodian feast became a congenial theme to Renaissance painters. Giotto's thirteenth-century Salome was forerunner in a long procession. From his hands she emerged, clad in austere garb of trailing close-sleeved robes. Her brows are coronetted as she plays upon her lyre before the seated Herod. In another compartment of the same picture, reverently as a nun upholding a sacred relic, she presents, like a docile child, the guerdon of a duty achieved at Herodias' feet. Then the new tide of colour and movement, with the surging joy of life, rose high over southern Europe. To that era of Decameronian sensuality the vigorous juxtaposition of pleasure and death, of saint and sinner, commended itself. It was a period of vital contrasts, of Machiavellian sophistry, pagan philosophy, and Savonarolian repentances, and Salomes multiplied in compositions where Herod, Herodias, headsman, guards and feasters are all alike depicted in the rich costumes of contemporary fashions, and seem to move in the very atmosphere of that vivid awakening of sense and intellect. For Fra Filippo Lippi (Suor Lucrezia's sometime lover, finally by grace of Cosimo de Medici and dispensation of Pius II,

her husband) Salome dances guileless, graceful in her rounded youth, all unconscious that the hand which lifts the folds of flowing drapery is dyed to the eyes of devout spectators with an indelible stain. Luini portrayed her—in aesthetic kinship to Leonardo's lost 'Daughters of Herodias'—grave, tranquil, psychologically enigmatical, a touch would convert her calm averted face, cold, delicate, royal, into a Madonna with its ripple of smooth-parted hair and quiet, reticent lips, while the severed head of the Baptist in its serene beauty suggests the loveliness of some perfectly modelled death-mask. In simple, unquestioning materialism, Titian pictured her with upraised arms, elevating the high-rimmed dish as though she were the bearer of piled-up grapes or ripe pomegranates in some gay festival of flowers and fruits. Andrea del Sarto—was it Lucrezia della Fede who served as model ?—in three consecutive narrative-paintings bestowed upon the figures of mother and daughter the muscular energies of Michael Angelo sibyls, accentuating the sense of action to the eclipse of the subtler sense of character and personality.

Dutch art took up the subject with zest. Burgher painters, prosperous citizens of prosperous towns, vied with beauty-loving Italian artists in the representation, so congenial to their gifts, of elaborate detail. Memling's 'Salome' wears a small embroidered cap and veil ; clad in ermine-edged brocade, she turns away from the grim sight as the executioner places the head upon the platter. Matsys conveys a hint of deprecation by the gesture with which she deposits the dish upon Herod's white-clothed supper-table. Karel van Mander presents her engaged in dancing a stately minuet or pavanne, with a comely young partner clad in a costly velvet doublet. But the full brutal ugliness of realist genius found expression in Cornelisz's full-faced Dutchwoman with primly covered hair, round forehead, small eyes, small mouth. Placid, revolting, his Salome is a burgeress who would have serenely polished the platter from which the dead half-open eyes of the distorted head are upturned to the phlegmatic countenance above.

The impression of emotional tragedy—perhaps the Luini portrayal is an exception—was not the aim of these showmen of the past : of Fra Lippo in monkish vesture ; of Titian, red-robed, the velvet cap upon his head, the gold chain about his neck ; of Sarto, senza errori, sad-faced and suffering ; of Memling, Matsys, Cornelisz, clothed in the sober wealth of prosperous citizens. The emotional effects of sacred iconography were, for the most part, stereotyped sentiments running in ordered currents of authorised tradition ; sympathies were

harnessed to the car of dogma. On the one hand the purpose of the undevout painter of sacred themes was to create a work of art which appealed to the aesthetic sense, on the other the aim of the devout cloistral artist was to create a work of devotion. To awaken, independently of devotional feelings, keen sympathies, to challenge thought, to rivet curiosity on problems of human passions, joys, sufferings, was, in the majority of cases, outside the intention of the artist. If such appeals existed they were, one may conjecture, fortuitous—the unconscious manifestations of a painter's own emotional idiosyncrasies, undercurrents of personal feeling forcing their way to the surface, colouring, for a moment, his vision, directing his hand and dominating the expression of his craftsmanship.

But with the passing of those great masters—who for us of to-day have become part of the very scenes they painted, part of a world where they, the showmen, with their Herods and Herodiases, their Salomes and Baptists, all live together in that brilliant atmosphere of Renaissance life—a new epoch, a new world of imagination and thought and passion supervened, where the emotional appeal became a supreme key-note. In that new world Heinrich Heine was the first of the moderns to lay his mocking hand upon the Herodian Queen whose story Josephus had told, and upon the Gospel incident of which old masters had faithfully preserved the outline even while they transfigured the semblance.

No such faith did the Jew-poet, the bitterest, if not as he called himself 'der beste der Humoristen,' keep with evangelic records or Jewish chronicle, as he in turn threw his limelight spectres upon the stage-sheet. Yet it is not Salome, but Herodias herself whose figure haunts his brain. It is the phantom of 'Judah's Queen' which appears in 'Atta Troll,' accompanied, as in medieval visions of hell, by a motley train of all who have offended God, Man, Art, or the poet. It is Herodias herself who passes the window of the mountain hut where the solitary watcher wakens at midnight to witness the apparition of the spectral Hunt.

'It was St. John's Eve, the moon was full, from the witchnest I could see right well the spirit-troop. Hussa! The tramp of horses, the bay of hounds, the hunter's horn-blast, the cries, the laughter! And in front, the quarry, stag and wild boar. Huntsmen too of all times—Nimrod first, next him Charles the Tenth—on white steeds they rode, and beside them, on foot, the *Pikeure*, and pages with torches ran beside. Others too. The Knight in gold, was he

not Arthur the King ? And Ogier the Dane in green chain armour, like a great green frog ! Also the heroes of thought, our Wolfgang, William, and on an ass our old friend Franz Horn—he who was Shakespeare's commentator.'

So with Greek nymphs, medieval damoizels, jocund, riotous, the mad Hunt defiles, till in the midst of the cavalcade three central figures magnetise his gaze. Diana, white as marble and as cold, overtaken at length by the love she, of old, eschewed even to the slaying of young Actaeon. 'Easy it was 'to know her by the crescent moon upon her head.' Next her was the Fay Abunde—'to recognise her was also a facile task, 'her smile was so sweet, her laughter so free, and her face, 'Master Greuze might have painted it ! Rose-red, heart-'shaped her mouth and between the open lips the small white 'teeth. . . .' Then the white Greek and rose-lipped Celt are gone by, and high on her white palfry, two Moors holding the gold-hemmed cloth, her nose small, curving, fine cut, her lips crimson as pomegranates, slim-limbed, the flush of the East-land on her cheek, came Herod's fair wife—she who was accursed for the slaying of the Baptist.

'In her hand she bears, for ever and ever, the dish and on it the head, and she kisses it—kisses it with passion. For she loved John. In the Bible it is not written, but folk-legend preserves the tale of Herodias' blood-stained love. Otherwise, that desire of hers were truly a riddle. Could a woman covet the head of a man whom she did not love ? It was haply an untoward fate for the Beloved. . . . And Herodias, when she saw the head, wept and madness fell upon her and she died.'

Thus Heine, to the grave scandal of M. Ary Renan (whose tolerance of Gustave Moreau's equally free version of the sacred theme suggests inconsistency), 'jongle si impudemment 'avec le récit évangélique.'

The poem proceeds. Close to the hut-window the Hebrew queen rides ; she plays as a child at ball-play with her ghastly toy. Then the woman accurst passes, and the tumult of the phantasmal chase dies in the distance, the spectral band has vanished ; silence, the cool moonlight, resume their sway on the ghost-ridden track. The note of personal emotion inseparable from Heine's handiwork was to come. 'Why didst thou look on me with eyes that were kind, O Herodias ?' asks the poet. Lost to sight, his thoughts pursue her. Is not he too an Israelite ? 'ein armer Jude' ? She obsesses his heart. 'Where, where do they abide, those ghosts of the 'midnight, when the day drives them hence ?' Diana, he

knows, seeks sanctuary from the lordship of Christ amid the ruined temples of Italy. Abunde Le Fay, she too flees the Nazarene ; she sleeps through the weary noons in Avalon :

'But thou, Herodias, say, where art thou ? Ah, in Jerusalem thou liest dead and buried. All day long stark and cold thou sleepest, but by night with those who hate Sorrow thou dost follow the Wild Hunt. I too would ride at thy side, for more than the Greek goddess, more than Avalon's Queen, I love thee, O thou dead Jewess. And by day I will sit by thy grave where thou sleepest, and weep. I will weep by the grave of my well-beloved, even by thy grave in Jerusalem. And the old Jews who pass will deem in truth that I mourn the overthrowing of the Temple, and for the Holy City which is overthrown.'

'Atta Troll' was published in 1847. Henri Regnault, orientalist and naturalist, shot while fighting in the artists' battalion during the French disasters of 1870, was the first modern of rank in art, as Heine in literature, to present the Herodias theme under new conditions of thought. His famous Salomé was exhibited in the Salon of 1871, a black-haired, dishevelled dancing-girl, seated upon an oriental stool, platter in hand, awaiting with smiling mouth the headsman's coming. Realistic in conception, callous in feeling, she anticipated in spirit the nautch-girl version of recent days. But the soldier artist had scarcely retired behind the scenes when a painter of far different calibre, Gustave Moreau, mystic and transcendentalist, embodied a fresh conception of the Herodian tale in 'Salomé 'dansant devant Hérode,' and 'L'Apparition' (appearing in the Salon of 1870), while in literature the emotional ironist, the individualist-poet, on whose enigmatical personality the Johannesnacht moon cast its uncertain illumination, had been replaced by 'l'Impassible'—Gustave Flaubert, whose treatment of his subject matter might stand as a temperamental antithesis to that of the Jewish poet.

To M. Gustave Moreau, in the words of his eloquent interpreter and disciple, M. Ary Renan, 'Salomé apparut magnifique 'et presque sacrée . . . Rien ne devait rappeler la débauche 'vulgaire, . . . elle entre, et le vent du Désir la suit ; dans 'les plis de ses voiles l'iniquité réside ; et sa face est pure.' Three other pictures from Moreau's hand, 'Salomé au Jardin,' 'Salomé à la Colonne,' 'Salomé au Léopard,' continued and completed the series.

Colourist and thinker, Moreau's pictorial version of the narrative, plunged in a deep-dyed atmosphere of mystic romanticism and exotic fatalism, has at once the dignity of thought, the richness of colour, and the wealth of imagination

belonging to his genius, so extravagant in conception, so severely restrained in execution. M. Ary Renan's study has summed up the effects aimed at and achieved in his works. Pillared and domed, the Herodian palace in its sombre magnificence is that of some dreamt-of temple. Incense burns there, the myriad lamp-flames of immense hanging clusters glint through the dusky solitude on gold and silver, on jewels and embroideries, carved marbles and gilded arabesques. A pontifical mitre upon his head, Herod is throned upon an altar-like shrine, immovable, rigid as an idol, awaiting with vacant eyes the doom that shall be accomplished. Motionless as the king, the executioner stands, with half-covered face, an attendant acolyte on the will of fate. Shadowed by a pillar Herodias sits, of as small account in the fulfilment of destiny as the musician who touches the strings of her instrument near by. In the foreground Salome, a daughter of Herodias, hitherto unknown to art or literature, to history or legend, advances. She is a woman whose youth is ripe: tall, imperial, a royal ecstatic, rigidly poised under the weight of gem-charged vestments. Grave, straight-featured, she holds a lily in one upraised hand; she is high priestess of a sensuality that includes but transcends the senses. Her passion is a flame that sears without heat, a corruption cold as the snow, whose ceremonial of seduction bears almost the semblance of a consecrated rite. 'L'Apparition' gives a second stage of the dramatic action. With half-bared limbs Salome is still poised in rhythmical movement before the mournful king upon his shadowy throne. The strings still give forth their rhythmic cadence under the musician's hand. But the dance is arrested, the eyes of the dancer, as those of a somnambulist, are tensely set upon the vision that confronts her—its effulgent rays almost touch her outstretched arm. A premonition of what shall be, against an aureole of light, calm, austere and beautiful, the Baptist's head with falling dew of blood fixes her gaze. On a third canvas, the dance is ended. Holding delicately a rose to her lips, she awaits the execution of her behest in the dungeon by the pillar with its severed chain, silent, incurious, ruthless, indifferent. Again bearing the aureoled head, re-robed in her royal garb her figure repeats 'In the Garden,' 'With the 'Leopard,' the initial conception. In each successive presentment Salome trenches upon the impersonalities of mystic types and mythical eras: upon the Sphinx, with her inscrutable secret; upon Medusa, with her monstrous beauty and her infection of death. Her action has the repose of statuary, her repose the immobility of inanition. She is a primitive

force, distilled in the poison of oriental sensuality, vitiated, isolated, tragic—a leper wearing the death-mask of a Helen.

To pass from the rhetorical conception of the painter to that of the greatest literary artist amongst his contemporaries is to exchange the surcharged atmosphere of mystic imagination for a frozen-clear air where every inflection of emotional psychology is silenced. Set in a framework of topographical accuracy and architectural exactitude, Flaubert summons the actors to play once more their several parts in the nineteen hundred years' old tragedy of blood. Effacing every evidence of his individuality behind the screen of an aesthetic cult which in its research for the impartialities of truth laid sympathy under a ban and set an interdict upon sentiment, he narrates the Macherus episode, piling detail on detail, himself an indifferent spectator of things that pass. We see the wide landscape outspread around the Dead Sea fortress where Herod, disquietude at his heart, paces the terrace at dawn. The sunrise dissipates the mist, point by point the mountain peaks are illuminated, the plains become visible feature by feature. Jordan flows white; the lake lies a blot of lazuli blue; the tower of Antonia, a monstrous cube, dominates Jerusalem; the shadowy palms surround Jericho. Then a second actor presents himself to view, the sinister executioner of the tetrarch's displeasures, while from his subterranean prison the voice of the Baptist reaches Herod's ears, a living menace to his wavering soul. Presently, in royal purple, Herodias enters, and from her lips comes a murderous cry. All the outraged pride of Mariamne's descendant breaks forth against the tetrarch of lesser lineage, against the ruler who yielded, in days gone by, to her passion but refuses, in the days that are, her vengeance. So the scene passes, and below upon an outspread carpet on a flat roof, her heavy hair bound with blue thongs, dressed in Roman guise, a girl bending and rebending, supple, graceful, young, unpacks, as if come from afar, tissues of silk, girdles, veils, and hanging ornaments. 'Qui est-ce?' Herodias's anger is suddenly appeased as the tetrarch, with eyes set on the young figure, asks—unanswered—the question.

To the hushed solitude of the eastern dawn succeeds clamour, confusion, a Babel of tongues. Vitellius with his lictors, Pharisee and Sadducee, Esseniens, the dreamers of dreams, Samaritans, the captains of Herod's bands, crowd the courts. The corruptions of Rome set their accent on the corruptions of Israel. Then before the feast, with its gross refinements of gluttony, and the sequel of the feast, comes a second intimation

that the small life, on which the issues of the death-drama hang suspended, lives, breathes, stirs, somewhere in the screened recesses of that massive palace-keep.

Possessed by a portent of misfortune Herod has sought the incense-perfumed chamber of Herodias.

'Sous une portière en face, un bras nu s'avança, un bras jeune, charmant et comme tourné dans l'ivoire par Polyclète. D'une façon un peu gauche, et cependant gracieuse, il ramait dans l'air, pour saisir une tunique oubliée sur une escabelle près de la muraille. Une vieille femme la passa doucement. Le Tétrarque eut un souvenir. "Cette esclave est-elle à toi?" "Que t'importe?' répondit Hérodias——'

Flaubert decorated the background to the feast with every outward accessory he could verify in the annals of the period; he resolutely abstained from guesswork concerning the unrecorded workings of thought or emotion on the part of the human personalities who participate in the action. He depicted, not the spiritual greenroom, but the public stage of events, with their exterior semblances. On a couch of ivory Herod reclines, black-mantled, with painted face and blue-powdered hair. As the feast draws to an end Herodias appears above, an Assyrian head-dress crowns her head. Simultaneously a small figure, covered with a filmy veil, girdled with jewels, her wide Eastern trousers glittering with gold, her shoes covered with down of humming-birds, enters, and as she lifts her veil the tetrarch beholds in Salome the Herodias of his long past love. She dances, and every movement is pictured. She is lighter than a butterfly, like a vagrant soul she simulates pursuit of some flying, ever-receding phantom. Languor succeeds, she weeps a god, or maybe, dies at a god's caress. Again, with the voluptuous passion of India and Egypt, she revives. Lithe and swift-limbed she circles round the table where Herod reclines, her lips are painted, her brows are darkened; sorceress, acrobat, she dances on in the wild fantasia of Eastern pantomime, and the air becomes charged with frenzied excitement, the rhythmic clash of metal, the voices of men sobbing, shouting, fill the place. Herod in his madness has made his frantic, blindfold proffer to do her will even to the half of his kingdom.

A pause. The human puppet, trained to her part, had ended her dance. For the first and only time in the 'Hérodias' her lips open. The sorceress-dancer has vanished, the vicious and sensual womanhood has slipped from her. It is as a tired, childish, uncomprehending marionette that she repeats

her lesson, and hesitating, indifferent, smiling, demands the guerdon of her task. The voice is Salome's, the words are the words of Herodias. 'Je veux que tu me donnes dans un plat 'la tête'—elle avait oublié le nom, mais reprit en souriant—'la tête de Jaokanann.' A brief suspense of expectancy, and Herod's oath is kept. The pale relic is displayed to the banqueters—to Herod. Herodias, still lingering in her high gallery with doors of gold, contemplates the scene. The guests depart. 'Lestement,' Salome ascends to where her mother waits; both retire from sight. The feast is over, the torches die, the vast, domed hall is deserted. Herod, his gaze fixed on the dead face, weeps alone, and Phanuel, the Essenien, he who loved John, at the far end of the great basilica, prays.

The figure of the Herodian princess was to undergo further transformations. To playwright and musician, to the dramatic stage, the opera stage and the music-hall, she owes her latest accretions of notoriety.

It is difficult to account for the incredible excitement which attended the publication and performance of Mr. Oscar Wilde's drama 'Salomé,' where the idea, incidentally introduced into the ironic burlesque of Heine's Johannesnacht fantasy, is developed seriously and at length as a tragic dramatic motive, is clothed in phraseology borrowed from M. Maeterlinck's earlier mannerism, and framed in a 'décor du théâtre' appropriate to a marionette show. The actors in the play, apart from biblical associations, are themselves little more than irresponsible puppets: 'ainsi font, font, font les marionettes. Trois petits tours, et puis—s'en vont,' and the far horizons of Moreau's mysticism, the living light-illuminated landscape, of Flaubert's background, are exchanged for the tent-walls of a portable, fair-day theatre. Salome herself resembles the heroine of a bygone Marchen, crazed, as such heroines never were, by heart maladies unknown to princesses of fairytale. She is akin, not to those Eastern women of whom Josephus wrote, Mariamne, Salome, Cipros, Glaphyra, Bernice, of Herodian fame, but to Maleine, to Mélisande, children whose premature womanhood films their loves with a noxious vapour. Like the 'shadow' of a white rose in a mirror of silver,' she walks the stage with hands 'that flutter like white butterflies' and feet like white doves. There is a terrace-court under the moon (which plays so conspicuous a dumb-show part in the drama); we hear the pleading of an adoring lover, to whose entreaties she turns a deaf ear. Stage attendants of varying nationalities and costumes, as in a masque of Christmas mummers, make elucidating and apposite comments on the princess, the moon,

the revellers in the adjacent banqueting-hall, and on the prisoner whose green-walled cistern-vault occupies the back of the stage and whose voice from time to time rises sonorously above the vociferous clamours of the Eastern palace. After discussions, expostulations and delays, at the little princess's bidding the prisoner is brought forth. The desert wanderer, in metaphors borrowed from the sacred books of dead prophets, pronounces maledictions upon all the inhabitants of the Herodian fortress. The little princess, with an inconsequence to which none but a genius could give even imaginative verisimilitude, falls on the instant—despite the intervention of the youthful lover—in love with the prisoner. She woos him in terms rifled from the Song of Songs, he replies in the language of Scriptural anathema. After a brief dialogue the little princess falls without modulation out of love into hate, and expresses her hatred in a vernacular as energetic as were the prisoner's denunciations. Incidentally the young lover expires at the feet—like dove's feet—of his obdurate mistress and the prisoner is relegated to his bronze-walled dungeon Then the villains of the puppet-show mystery-play enter. An amorous and sullen king, a jealous and vengeful queen, with their court. Some lengthy speeches indicate surrounding circumstances, and after a protracted altercation the little princess, heedless of the jealous queen's remonstrance, indifferent to the infatuation of the old king as she had proved impervious to the devotion of the young lover, begins to dance, although premonitory signs abound of ill to ensue, though the moon shines in ominous redness and the sound of the wings of death is in the wind. Her dance ended, she demands her reward from the reluctant king. A long expostulation suspends action, but at length the negro headsman retires behind the cistern walls and presently a black arm emerges and places the severed head in the hands—like white butterflies—of the little princess, who falls, once again with no modulation, from hate to love, and kisses the head, as Herodias in the Johannesnacht had kissed before, while darkness obscures the stage. Finally, at the sudden command of the retreating king, Salome is slain in a ray of the sinister moon whose shining inaugurated the tragedy.

There is no doubt much else beside the pantomime action of the play. A considerable amount of poetic imagery exists in it, of poetic raving and of discursive dialogue relating to historic, traditional, or sacred events culled from Josephus, the Gospels, and Flaubert. A distinct atmosphere, a tinted malarial haze, produced by sustained or monotonously repeated

emotional notes, likewise clings to the persons and scenes presented. Approach to realism—imaginative, descriptive, or pictorial—there is none in the whole drama, nor is any intended. And Salome is little more than the effigy of a pale child stricken with unwholesome maturity of passion, a pitiful, maladive little figure in perfumed veils, dancing barefoot under the moon upon a marble floor splashed with blood, a diminutive night-flowering blossom, distilling its tiny poison-drop of dew in the tainted air of an Eastern palace.

With the transition from the play to the opera-house, from the opera-house to the 'danse macabre' of the music-hall, the story of the degradation of a princess, of Salome, lineal descendant of Mariamne whose pride of birth no terror of death could abate, is complete. The opera of Herr Strauss has reft the last shreds of royalty from her. The naïve charm of Giotto's nun-like child, the simple tranquillity of Pisano's bas-relief, the graceful cadence of motion in Lippi's gentle dancer, the delicate reserve of Luini's Madonna-faced enigma, the health of Titian's joyous embodiment of beauty, the vigorous power of Sarto's dignified women, even the frank brutality of Cornelisz, preserved, in widely differing degrees, some indication of blood royalty. The fantastic vision of Heine, the finely chiselled classicism of Flaubert's girl-automaton, the silent symbolic calm of Moreau's Medusian mystery emphasised it. But with the dispersion of the gauze effects, of the far-off atmosphere of Wilde's original drama, in which the intentional and essential unreality mitigated to a certain extent the more repulsive qualities, the opera theme is precipitated into the coarse and morbid sensationalism of an ignoble travesty. And the force of the work, when analysed, may fairly be said to be based, not on its power to stimulate the senses by the presentment of objects, mental, visual, or emotional, calculated to attract, but by its inverse power to offer what stimulates to the full the instinct of recoil, physical and moral.

In an age which extorts the spectacle of violence at first hand to reanimate its numb aesthetic sensibilities, the veil art drew of old between the ugliness of savage deeds and their presentment to the eye, has been withdrawn. It is a singular fact that whereas the tendency of art in the past, when human barbarities were enacted without let, hindrance, or shame in the open street and public market-place, was to seek in ideals of beauty compensation for the crude and hideous horrors of actuality, the tendency of art in an age when crude physical and moral horrors are perpetrated behind elaborate screens

civilisation erects for their concealment, has been a converse effort. Art has ministered and without stint in both fiction and drama to the craving for excitement of nerves blunted by over-stimulation and of imaginations insensitive to any emotional appeal when unaccompanied by an appeal to physical sensationalism. The Salome of the accomplished musician whose genius illustrates, no doubt triumphantly, the aesthetic value of violence, has incarnated intellectually and sensorially the spirit of that craving. The daughter of Herodias retains no least rag of her purple; she has become a bayadère, a nautch-girl of the bazaar, pursuing with unashamed sensuality the prey of her leopard-passion. The contortionist of medieval MS. has found her hideous spiritual counterpart in a psychological deformation, an abnormal disruption of human qualities as aesthetically insincere as it is spiritually grotesque; and Strauss's interpretation justifies to the full the exclamation of the appalled king, horror-stricken through all the panoply of his own gross lusts, as he turns from the stage where her small white figure stands, possessed by a desire beside which his fiercest cravings pale: 'Sie ist ein Ungeheuer!'

'She is a monster'—even so—and the monstrosity of the little princess of the marionette-play, the monstrosity of the painted puppet seen through the medium of an atmosphere vapoured over with fantasy, is all that remains of her as she leaves the remodelling hands of the greatest opera-writer of the day. And the last of that strange sisterhood of Herodian daughters, as history, tradition, legend, painting, literature, and dramatic art have depicted them for twenty centuries, closes her career an outcast from human sympathy, crushed beneath the shields of Herod's soldiers or living out her pariah existence in supplementary tableaux-dances or sordid burlesques of the variety stage.

From fiction back to history. Josephus, involved and prolix, the matter-of-fact historian of 'die todte Judin' and her nation, offered an alternative ending. 'Her [Herodias's] 'daughter, Salome, was married to Philip, son of Herod of 'Trachonites, and, as he died childless, Aristobulus, son of 'Herod the brother of Agrippa, married her; they had three 'sons, Herod, Agrippa, and Aristobulus—and this was the 'posterity of Phasaelus and Salampsio. *

Thus the Salome of historic record vanishes from the scene—

* Salampsio was a daughter of Herod the Great, who married her first cousin Phasaelus (Josephus, bk. xviii. chap. v.), from whom (apparently) Salome's husband claimed descent.

wife, widow, again wife, the mother of sons. But the story of Herodias was not ended. The Herodian lust of dominion ran in her veins, nor could she brook any rival lordship. Her brother Herod-Agrippa, after a spendthrift youth, returned from Italy, to live a dependant on Herod's favour at Tiberias. One day, as the two drank together, 'Herod hit him in the 'teeth with his poverty.' Enraged, Agrippa went forth to seek his fortunes elsewhere. After many wanderings, with vicissitudes of debts and borrowings, he again sought refuge in the land of the Caesars. But Tiberias gave judgement against him, and, clothed still in purple, in bonds amongst captives, he paid the penalty of his follies before the gates of the palace at Tusculum. The tide of fortune turned. 'Leaning 'on a tree for grief,' the Herodian captive mourned his fate. On the bough of the tree an owl, so Josephus records the incident, had perched. A northern fellow-prisoner, seeing the portent, made known to Agrippa that happiness still awaited him, yet 'when again thou shalt see the bird know 'thou hast but five days to live.' Tiberius died: 'the Lion is 'dead,' a running freedman of Agrippa's household brought tidings to his master in bonds; and Caligula reigned in Tiberius' stead. Imperial grace was extended to the Jew, a golden chain replaced the chain of iron, and with the insignia of royalty Agrippa sought triumphantly once again the country whence he had fled: 'he marched,' says Josephus, 'as a king 'amid the multitude.'

The spectacle was gall to Herodias; emulation and rage stirred the woman whom ambition swayed. 'Let Herod-'Antipas be no less a king than Herod-Agrippa,' was the cry of the grand-daughter of the Asmonean Queen. With silver and gold Herod and Herodias set sail for Rome. What availed silver and gold, if no crown crowned the tetrarch's brows? But the ship of Agrippa's messenger sailed as fast as the ship which bore Herodias. In Herod's armoury armour was stored for seventy thousand men, so the messenger brought report to the ears of Caius, and to Roman suspicions it was proof sufficient that Herod meditated treason. Herod's tetrarchy was taken from him and given to Agrippa, all that he had was declared forfeit, and he himself was banished to die in exile at Lyons, a city of Gaul. Herodias, for sake of her brother Agrippa, whom she hated, was nevertheless exempted from all penalties, 'but she made this reply: Thou 'indeed, O Emperor, actest after a magnificent manner . . . 'but the kindness I have for my husband hinders me from partaking of the favour of thy gift; for it is not just that

'I, who have been made a partner in his prosperity, should 'forsake him in his misfortunes.' Thus Herodias, with Herod-Antipas, departed and were seen no more in the land of Galilee and Judea. Herod-Agrippa I. ruled in their stead.

His rule was brief. In the third year of his reign in Judea

'he came to the city Cesarea . . . and there exhibited shows in honour of Caesar . . . on the second day of which shows he put on a garment made wholly of silver and of a contexture truly wonderful, and came into the theatre early in the morning; at which time the silver of his garment being illuminated by the first reflexion of the sun's rays on it was so resplendent as to spread an horror over those that looked intently on him.'

The cry went up, recorded in the Scriptures, 'It is the voice 'of a god!' Agrippa heard and he kept silence, accepting that attribute of deity. Then, looking upward, 'he saw an 'owl sitting on a rope over his head,' even as when he leant a purple-clad prisoner against a green tree under Italian skies the brown-winged herald had perched amongst the leaves. And seeing the bird a deep sorrow weighed down the heart of the silver-vestured king. And 'because he gave not God 'the glory,' he was smitten with a loathsome malady, as the great Herod in days gone by, and in five days the king whom the crowd had numbered with the immortals was numbered with those who go down into the grave.

Herod-Agrippa II. succeeded to his father's estate. Something of the old pomp, the lordly magnificence, a shadowy purple of the past, clung to the last of the Herodians whom Paul 'almost persuaded to be a Christian,' although upon that memorable day Bernice, on whom lay the stain of evil report, sat unashamed by his side in the Caesarean judgement-hall. And upon the women of the race the gift of an hereditary beauty still focussed the passions of men. It had descended upon Drusilla, who did 'exceed all other women in beauty,' and, it would seem, upon her sisters, Mariamne, and upon Bernice of the judgement-hall, who wedded and unwedded themselves according to the licence of Herodian usage. Yet the glory of the House of Herod was departed. Agrippa, a renegade to the national honour, fought in the Roman legions, and when of Jerusalem, the holy city, not one stone remained upon another, Agrippa, and Bernice with him, vanished ingloriously from the land where in corruption, ferocity, and splendour the dynasty of Herod the Great had upreared thrones, palaces, and sepulchres.

Art. III.—THE COURT OF STAR CHAMBER.

1. *Select Cases before the King's Council in the Star Chamber, commonly called the Court of Star Chamber.* Edited for the Selden Society by I. S. Leadam. London. 1902 and 1910.
2. *A Study of the Court of Star Chamber.* By Cora L. Scofield. Chicago. 1900.
3. *Treatise of the Court of Star Chamber.* By William Hudson. Collectanea Juridica (1792), vol. ii. pp. 1–240.

'It had long been held by lawyers, as it is held by lawyers at 'this day, that the jurisdiction of the Star Chamber was 'extended, not created, by the Statute of Henry VII.' * So wrote the historian of the Stuart period when he tells of the application of Robert Chambers in 1629 to the Court of Exchequer, by which he sought to invalidate the decree of the Star Chamber against himself, of which we speak on a later page. But when this same accurate historian comes to describe the conclusion, in 1641, of this remarkable jurisdiction, he speaks of the Star Chamber as a distinct Court. 'With respect 'to two Bills for the abolition of the Courts of Star Chamber 'and High Commission he (the King) announced that he must 'take time for consideration. On the 5th the required assent 'was given to both bills. . . .† The extraordinary Courts 'which had been the support of the Tudor Monarchy dis-'appeared.' If ever there was a distinct Court, it was the Court of High Commission confined as it was to ecclesiastical causes, and possessing, as it did, a definite jurisdiction and constitution. With this tribunal Gardiner rightly couples the Star Chamber. As a Court it was created by the Act of 1487 Pro Camera Stellata,‡ and one cannot doubt that the intention of Henry VII. was by that Statute to establish a new and a statutory tribunal. A statement of this kind is plain enough, yet we seem to be involved in difficulties and obscurities, when we come to review the history of the Court of Star Chamber, because its proceedings cannot be completely separated from the business of the King's Council before and after 1487. Even those who drafted the Act Pro Camera Stellata appear to treat the Court of Star Chamber as if it were already a recognised

* Gardiner's 'History of England,' vol. vii. p. 86.
† 16 Carol. I. c. 10. (1641).
‡ 3 Henry VII. c. 1.

tribunal. It is entitled 'An Act giving the Court of Star 'Chamber authority to punish divers misdemeanours.' It is undeniable that the King's Council had long exercised a varied jurisdiction, often against the will of Parliament, and had from time to time sat in an apartment called the Star Chamber. 'In the Close Roll of 29 Ed. 4, m. 26, d., is a record of the 'Council sitting in the Star Chamber for the transaction of legal 'business on the 7th of March 1355. The members present are 'the Archbishop of York, Chancellor, the Lord Treasurer, who 'was the Bishop of Winchester, the King's Chamberlain, the 'Keeper of the Privy Seal, John Beauchamp, a Baron and others 'of the Council. In 1367 the Chancellor, the Treasurer, the 'Justices, and other discreet (sages) personages hear a suit in 'the Star Chamber.' * But it was not an established judicial tribunal.

An earlier Act,† passed in 1453, is sometimes regarded as bearing on the position of the Star Chamber as a Court, but that statute appears only to have made the jurisdiction of the King's Council for certain purposes more effective. In consequence of great riots, extortions and so forth, Sheriffs, says the statute, were to assist in bringing before the Council any person summoned to appear before it. Therefore, before 1487 we find only the King's Council exercising a judicial jurisdiction at once undefined and arbitrary. 'From the time of Henry VI. 'to that of Richard II. its authority was met by the constant 'attacks of Parliament,' ‡ until the reign of Henry VII. the Council was, in fact, jealously watched by Parliament. And further we perceive that a custom had arisen of usually sitting in a particular apartment in the Palace of Westminster.

It is surprising that so much obscurity surrounds the origin of the name of this Court. 'The name Star Chamber,' writes Dr. Busch, 'was taken from the room where the Privy Council 'met in the Palace of Westminster. Various theories exist as

* Select Cases in the Star Chamber, vol. i. p. 47. It is some justification for the adverse criticism on the publication by the University of Cambridge of the latest edition of the 'Encyclopædia Britannica,' that though Vol. 1 of the 'Selden Society Select Cases,' and Miss Scofield's able and valuable monograph were published some time before the last edition of the Encyclopædia, they are not mentioned in the authorities at the end of the article on the Star Chamber. In the body of the article also, Acts of Parliament are referred to without the date of year, and without the sessional number of the Statute.

† 31 Hen. VI. c. 2.

‡ Dicey, 'Privy Council,' p. 69.

'to the origin of the name: it is usually supposed that the 'ceiling was decorated with gilt stars. Cf. also Pauli, p. 543. 'Another somewhat ingenious and not improbable explanation 'given by Blackstone (Commentaries, vol. iv. p. 436 f. note) 'derives the name from the place where were deposited the 'contracts and obligations of the Jews: starra or starrs, from 'the Hebrew Shètar . . .; another somewhat poetical conjecture 'is offered by Hudson in Collect. Jur., vol. ii. p. 8.'* Hudson's poetical conjecture, which Dr. Busch did not trouble to state, would be more properly called an absurd suggestion. It was that as the stars reflect the light of the sun, so the members of the Star Chamber gave forth the judicial wisdom of the king.

On this point one ought to rely somewhat on the researches of antiquaries. Stow, who was admittedly a careful observer, has left us a description of the Star Chamber in the reign of Elizabeth: 'This place is called the Star 'Chamber, because the roofe thereof is decked with the 'likeness of starrs guilt.'† This seems conclusive, but in Brayley and Britton's 'Westminster Palace' the ceiling of the Star Chamber, which stood among various apartments on the east side of New Palace Yard near the Thames which were pulled down between 1807 and 1836, is described as being of oak with moulded compartments ornamented with roses, pomegranates, portcullises, and fleurs-de-lys. This description is verified by an illustration. It seems probable therefore that the original chamber was altered and rebuilt in the time of Elizabeth, since 'the 'date 1602 with the initials E. R. separated by an open rose 'on a star was carved over one of the doorways.'‡ In an illustration in an interesting illuminated MS. § in the library of Lambeth Palace, Earl Rivers is depicted presenting his book

* Busch, 'England under the Tudors,' p. 388.

† Vol. ii. p. 119; ed. 1908 reprinted from the edition of 1603.

‡ Brayley and Britton, 'Westminster Hall,' p. 443.

§ Dictes and Sayings of the Philosophers (C.O.D. Lambeth 265). This is a translation from the French of Jehan de Teonville by Anthony Wydville, Earl Rivers, who completed the work in 1477. The MS. at Lambeth is stated by the transcriber to have been finished on the 24th of December in the seventeenth year of the reign of Edward IV. The book as printed by Caxton differs from the MS., and the so-called figure of Caxton in the illustration is in fact that of a tonsured priest. The picture is reproduced as a frontispiece to Walpole's 'Catalogue of Royal and Noble Authors,' vol. ii.

and Caxton his printer to Edward IV., in a chamber on the ceiling of which are lines of stars. It is clear therefore that a chamber, the ceiling of which was ornamented with stars, existed in Westminster Palace at least as early as at the end of the fifteenth century in which the King's Council assembled, and from which, in all probability, the Court of Star Chamber took its name, one which still recalls many memorable scenes, diverse, impressive, and in the last phase, detestable.

If we endeavour to keep our minds undisturbed by legal technicalities, the course of events in regard to the Court of Star Chamber does not seem difficult to follow. Henry VII. moved much about his kingdom, often for purposes of sport. These royal progresses must have kept him in touch with affairs in various parts of England, and his observant and sagacious mind would certainly be impressed by the necessity of finding a means to increase the effectiveness of justice in the interests of the people at large. On the one hand he saw the ordinary Courts of Law incapable from various causes of fulfilling their duty; on the other, he perceived his Council—which already occasionally exercised, by virtue of his own prerogative, judicial powers—composed of capable men, and what was at this time of equal importance, working under his immediate supervision. Henry, self-reliant though he was by nature, was diplomatic and tactful, and the ingenious idea of making a statutory Court out of a body which derived its power solely from the royal prerogative occurred to him. The necessity for the Act—which was only one of a series of statutes passed in the reign of the two Henrys to carry out a consistent policy, namely, the spread of law and order in the realm—is shown by the preamble, which recites the offences which went unpunished—the wrongful action of sheriffs in making panels and other returns, the takings of money by juries, riots and unlawful assemblies, so that 'the policy and good rule of 'this realm is almost subdued.' The intention of the king appears from the operative part of the Statute—misdoers were to be punished for their wrongful acts after the form and effect in like manner 'as they should and ought to be punished 'if they were convicted after due order of law.' The new statutory tribunal was in effect to be auxiliary to existing Courts, and it was to consist of the Chancellor, the Treasurer, and the Keeper of the Privy Seal, together with a Bishop, and a Temporal Lord of the Council, the two Chief Justices of the King's Bench and Common Pleas, or in their absence two other Justices. Extreme precision in the form and jurisdiction of

municipal tribunals is a feature of modern times, but the enumeration of certain persons to whom jurisdiction was given by parliamentary authority to all intents and purposes implies the creation of a new municipal Court.

One aspect of the Court of Star Chamber is as a potent influence in the movement from medievalism to modernism in England. In relation to the anarchic state into which the country had drifted before the accession of Henry VII. and to the urgency of more effective legal methods the Court of Star Chamber is only a temporary remedy for temporary circumstances. Medievalism is, broadly speaking, synonymous with turbulence, modernism with the reign of law. The harsh hand of the armoured baron was incompatible with the increase of commerce and of more skilful agriculture; the robber and the waste belonged to feudal times. Justice was an essential concomitant of economical and social improvement, and it was in strengthening justice throughout England, in enlarging the area of law and order—at a time when there was a great world-movement towards humanism—that the Court of Star Chamber seems so remarkable a factor—a factor not only in the fulfilment of a striking personal policy, but also an element in the inevitable progress of a widespread national change, a change from one epoch to another.

The difference between a judicial tribunal based on a parliamentary title and one brought into action by the personal act of the monarch is vital and fundamental, especially in a country such as England in the fifteenth century, when the power of Parliament had become a recognised constitutional element. It is this radical difference between the King's informal Council and the Court of Star Chamber after 1487, with its public sittings in term time only, and hearing evidence on oath, which has been insufficiently appreciated by Miss Scofield and other commentators on the Star Chamber. No doubt after the creation of the Court the royal power for judicial purposes was actually, though not nominally, strengthened, as was shown unhappily in a succeeding century under different circumstances. But this does not displace the fact that in 1487 there was brought into existence in England a new tribunal created by Parliament, having definite Judges and a particular jurisdiction. It was, when at first established, more than a 'special committee' * of the Council, for the latter was an indefinite body called into action by the King to assist him in the government of his kingdom; it existed primarily

* Busch, 'England under the Tudors' p. 268.

for administrative and not for judicial purposes, whereas the Court established by Parliament in 1487 was, as we have shown, as definite a judicial tribunal as it is possible to conceive.

But as is clearly pointed out in the lucid and learned Introductions to each of the two volumes of the Selden Society's publications which deal with the select Cases in the Star Chamber, the new Court soon broke down as a defined tribunal, and became in fact merely a statutory sub-committee of the King's Council, which exercised an extremely varied criminal and civil jurisdiction, although the ordinary municipal tribunals were in being. The 'Statute,' says Mr. Leadam, 'was not interpreted by the Crown lawyers as imposing re-'strictions upon the indefinite powers attached to the King's 'Council, which the Court of Star Chamber conceived 'itself to be.'* The result was certainly anomalous, and from a legal point of view even puzzling. To all intents and purposes this sub-committee, if we like so to describe it, was popularly recognised as a Court. But having been instituted as part of a particular personal policy, neither Henry VII. nor his son apparently troubled themselves much either about its constitution or its procedure, so long as it in fact fulfilled the primary purpose for which it was established.

As the Court was constituted by the Statute of 1487 the sovereign formed no part of it. But Henry VIII. at any rate was sometimes present, and in the Stuart period James I. was a frequent attendant at its deliberations. In the case of the Mayor of Newcastle and the Artificers of Newcastle the king was present, at the delivery of the judgement, 'presentibus 'tunc in eadem Camera sua regia celsitudine ac. . . .' This occurred on the 6th of May 1516, and the fact that on this day Henry was at the Court of Star Chamber is mentioned in a letter from Thomas Allen to the Earl of Shrewsbury.† Henry was doubtless at this judgement merely as a spectator, for he had not heard the arguments in the case, but he is naturally mentioned in the preamble of the judgement. Whether he was, in the opinion of lawyers, technically a member of the Court was a matter which we cannot consider. As statesmen, both the Henrys were satisfied to effect certain results with the sanction of Parliament without troubling about legal technicalities.

That the Star Chamber should have increased its jurisdiction so as soon to become a Court which entertained civil actions is

* Select Cases in the Star Chamber, vol. ii. p. 62.

† Ibid. p. 116.

not surprising, when we bear in mind that the same facts will often found a civil action as well as a criminal prosecution, especially in days when jurisdictions are not well defined. Thus in 1508 an instance appears of a case in which the widowed Lady Strange complains that one Humphrey Kynaston forcibly entered her grounds and pasture, and cut down, and carried away eighty great oaks, to the utter destruction of her inheritance.* Such an act in modern times would found an action for trespass with resulting damages. But whether Kynaston was to be tried by the Star Chamber as a criminal or not is not shown from the single document which remains. But this example is sufficient for our present purpose, for it indicates how easily the Star Chamber could develope into a civil Court, though in the first instance its jurisdiction was entirely criminal and administrative.

Another case—that of Vale *v.* Broke† in 1493 is valuable as an example of the fact that the Common Law Courts were at this time unable to do justice between man and man. In this instance Simon Vale of Castle Bromwich in Warwickshire complains that one John Broke and Alice his wife, inhabitants of the same town, maliciously slandered him amongst his neighbours by alleging that he, his wife and children were thieves and common robbers. And it is noticeable that the complainant alleged that 'he is not able to sue the sons John Broke and his 'wife at your common law.' The squabble seems to have been petty enough, since Broke alleges against Vale much the same misdoings as the latter complained of. But the merits of the dispute are immaterial—the importance of the case lies in the interesting illustration which it affords of the ease with which, within a few years of the passing of the Star Chamber Act, the jurisdiction of the tribunal was invoked to decide a dispute which was essentially one within the purview of the Common Law Courts.

Trial by jury had in fact broken down, and the weakness of a popular form of procedure had to be remedied by reliance on a system which, though made legal by Act of Parliament, was undoubtedly one more suitable to an autocratic than to a democratic form of government. Theories, as is shown by the last example, are often useless, if the circumstances are unfavourable to the principle. On the other hand, it may be urged that had Henry VII. been satisfied to try to strengthen the Common Law Courts without establishing a new Statutory

* Select Cases in the Star Chamber, vol. i. p. 274.

† Ibid. p. 38.

Court, the Star Chamber would not have become available in a succeeding age as an intolerable instrument of tyranny.

No little discussion has taken place as to whether the Judges mentioned in the Act Pro Camera Stellata were actually responsible for the decisions of the Court, or were only assessors called in to advise the lay and ecclesiastical members of the tribunal on points of law. The right conclusion on this point may be given in Mr. Leadam's words in reference to the Abbot of Shrewsbury's case :

> 'What then of the King's Justices summoned under that Act ? It is quite clear from the wording both of the judgment and of the exemplification, as well as of the opinion of the draughtsman of the Abbot's second Bill, and of the Abbot himself, who was a lord of Parliament, that they were advisers and not judges of the Court.' *

Moreover so soon after the passing of the famous Act as 1493, the Common Law Judges passed a resolution that there was 'Nul juge sinon Chancelier, Treasurer ou Privy-seel ou deux 'de eux et les autres sont assistants et aidants et nemy Juges.'† As time went on however, the irresponsible position of the Judges was altered, and a strict adherence to the Act ceased, and in the years which preceded the end of the Court we find that those who attended the sittings of it stated their views as to the sentence to be inflicted—generally being more lenient than the Bishops and the Temporal Peers, who also formed the Court in the age of the Stuarts.

Scarcely less discussion is observable in regard to procedure, as for instance whether a defendant should be summoned by means of a Letter or Writ of Privy Seal, or by a subpoena,‡ and to whom the prayer for Summons should be addressed, whether to the King or to the Chancellor. But these and similar points, which show a remarkable diversity of technical practice, are essentially of secondary importance, and are now without interest except to the student of purely legal antiquities in relation to procedure. The main fact to be borne in mind is that Henry VII. established a statutory Court, which was maintained by further parliamentary authority in the reign of his son—in 1529—when the Lord President was added as

---

* Select Cases in the Star Chamber, vol. i. p. 37.

† Y.B.E.T., 8 Hen. VII., f. 13, pt. 7.

‡ In eleven cases Letters of Privy Seal were thrice prayed, the despatch of a sergeant-at-arms four times, Writs of Subpoena twice and in two cases the form was not specified. Select Cases in the Star Chamber, vol. i. p. 25.

a member of the Court, though it is noticeable that the words Star Chamber do not occur in the Statute.

The interest of this Statute* is twofold; it indicates that Henry VIII. was following the policy of his predecessor, and that the necessity for the Court still continued, and one may also assume that a high official would not by name have been added to the tribunal if he had been in the habit of attending without statutory authority. On the other hand it may have been thought that as in practice he sometimes formed one of the Court, it was desirable that his attendance should be legalised.

How the Court by degrees varied from its statutory constitution, and whether the king ever expected that it could continue to work as it was defined by the Statute, are points of greater interest, touching as they do on the course of political life and political purpose in the age of the Tudors. But beyond these questions in interest, and unmeasurably more important than any technical details, are the relations of the Court of Star Chamber to the social and economical life of the age, and the contrast it daily affords between the patriotic and popular, if personal, rule of the Tudors and the short-sighted and tyrannical proceedings of the Stuarts.

It is certain that in a very short time the narrow composition of the Court ceased in practice. Sir Thomas Smith, who wrote in 1565, stated that the Judges of the Court were the Lord Chancellor, the Lord Treasurer, all of the Queen's Council, and the barons of the land; such was the view of a writer on the Commonwealth of England less than a century after the Act Pro Camera Stellata was passed.† The cause of the neglect of the provisions of the Act as regards the members of the Court was primarily practical. The Lord Privy Seal and the Lord Treasurer were men of high and varied duties, which made it difficult for them to sit as Judges at least three days in the week. Their places had therefore to be filled on some occasions by other important personages, and it would thus be easy for the one 'temporal lord of the King's Council' to be accompanied by other peers. It was hardly likely also that the nobility would lose an opportunity of retaining judicial power

* 21 Henry VIII. c. 20. An Act that the President of the King's Council shall associate with the Chancellor and Treasurer of England and the Keeper of the King's Privy Seal.

† For descriptions of the composition of the Court by Bacon and other writers see Anson, 'Law and Custom of the Constitution,' 3rd ed., vol. ii. p. 73.

as members of the Council, and thus in no short time the efficient and practical tribunal which Henry VII. had intended to create, became in fact merely a committee of the King's Council, with a quite unlimited criminal and civil jurisdiction, prying into all matters small and great.* The prerogatival judicial jurisdiction of the Council, necessarily vague and boundless, had become in effect statutory, since it was exercised nominally by a statutory tribunal and could only be abolished by the same power which created it—the two Houses of Parliament.

That opinions as to the origin of this Court should differ, that theories should be evolved, and that forms should be prayed in aid of this or that view was but natural; but now, with all the facts before us that have gradually been made available, the genesis and the existence of the Court of Star Chamber appears to be plain.

In a recent work on the history of English law, it was shown how striking are the illustrations of social movements to be found in the records of the law courts.† The Mulsho Case, which occupies many pages of the second volume of the Cases in the Star Chamber, depicts with remarkable vividness the story of a struggle between a landlord bent on enclosing common land, and his tenants and commoners. Apart from the light which this narration—in spite of its imperfections in parts—throws on the life of the age, it is a further proof that the extensive enclosures of the eighteenth century were but a continuation in an accentuated form of a movement which had been for centuries in existence. A popular idea still prevails that the Enclosure Acts in the eighteenth and in the beginning of the nineteenth century were a peculiarity of the age, whereas they were only part of a change of rural ownership which had been, in a slighter degree, long before evident.‡

The interesting and suggestive conflict contained in the different Mulsho cases began in 1494, and appears to have dragged on for more than half a century to 1538. On the one side was the overbearing landowner John Mulsho, Lord of the Manor of Thingden in Northamptonshire, a landed proprietor of good family, and evidently a man of grasping disposition and pertinacious determination. On the other side were

* 'In a word there is no offence punishable by law, but if the Court find it grow in the Commonwealth this Court may lawfully punish it, except only where life is questioned.' Hudson, part ii., p. 15.

† 'The Growth of English Law,' by E. S. Roscoe, p. 92.

‡ See 'Common Law and Inclosure,' by Prof. E. C. K. Gonner (London: 1912), p. 130.

ranged the inhabitants of Thingden, now known as Finedon, the leader of whom seems to have been one Henry Selby, a copyholder of the Manor. The outstanding feature of the contest is not the obstinate and self-willed determination of John Mulsho—who by the way died in 1536, and was followed by Robert Mulsho who was equally assertive—but the dogged resolution of the people of Thingden. There was no sign on their part of any feeling of inequality, they fought as equals. Whatever might have been the case if the contest had been one against a great feudal lord, it was clear that in the opinion of the people their rights were as important, and as capable of vindication, as those of the lords of manors. The two main complaints of the tenants and labourers were that Mulsho unlawfully enclosed common lands, and that he claimed unreasonable fines on renewals of tenancies—fixity of tenure on payment of a reasonable fine being the important principle for which the people of the locality on this point contended.

'The earliest proceeding mentioned in these documents is a decree of the Court of Star Chamber, dated July 1, 9 Henry VII. (1494). The complainants were the inhabitants of Thingden, and John Mulsho was the defendant. Neither the pleadings nor the decree have survived. But the substance of the decree is set out, presumably with correctness, by Henry Selby in the bill filed against John Mulsho in the Star Chamber, printed as document F. According to this, Mulsho having inclosed "common grounde and pasture lyenge in the fyldes" of Thingden, was ordered to throw his inclosures down. This decree he obeyed, and, as this is an admission made by his opponents, it may be taken to be true. For some years these particular parcels of land remained open as before.' *

On the death of Henry VII. in 1509, the struggle recommenced; whether this event was the cause of it or whether it was a mere coincidence showing a determination on the part of Mulsho to get the better of the commoners, it is impossible now to say. At any rate there was a formal complaint to the Star Chamber by the freeholders and inhabitants that time out of mind and of right they had a right of common for their beasts and cattle in certain specified lands and that by the inclosure of the same these rights were interrupted, as well as their means of reaching other common land. Also Mulsho had enclosed 'a common 'balk' or strip of unploughed ground between two ploughed portions, on which balk the inhabitants used to have their procession way once in the year. Here we have a glimpse of medieval customs for the purpose of asserting a right of way.

* Select Cases in the Star Chamber, vol. ii. p. 60.

Next, and here we see how history in these latter days repeats itself, the same John Mulsho hath nourished great numbers of conies whereby all their fields have been greatly hurt. Then follow more complaints of enclosures, and a declaration that Mulsho had not obeyed the former decree in all respects, and had indeed increased his enclosures, trusting to his great riches and power. So the poor freeholders and inhabitants pray for relief. The decree of the Star Chamber tells us how this part of the litigation ended.

'Both the draught and the final decree are much the same in tenour. They set forth that the defendant Mulsho, having lately inclosed and dyked certain ground in the fields of Thingden, was to be suffered to retain quiet possession of his inclosures, while, on the other hand, the inhabitants were to continue to enjoy their accustomed rights of road and footpath, abstaining from claim to any common of pasture in the inclosures. Mulsho was, however, enjoined to make no more inclosures, and was ordered to abate a nuisance of an excessive number of rabbits of which the inhabitants complained as destructive to their crops.' *

At this point of the story it is desirable to pause in order to note that in the draft decree the names of the judges are given as those of Archbishop Warham, of the Chancellor, the Earl of Surrey, Lord Treasurer, and of Foxe, Bishop of Winchester, the Lord Privy Seal, which corresponds with the three high officials named in the Star Chamber Act of 1487. Moreover, they sat in the Inner Chamber of the Star Chamber. But the final decree itself was promulgated in the presence of sixteen high laymen and ecclesiastics, in fact of the King's Council.

To continue the narration of the Mulsho case, though the remaining years of this interminable litigation would be neither interesting nor profitable. For sixteen years there was peace in the Northamptonshire village until Mulsho began to demand unreasonable fines on changes of tenancies. Incidental points arose as to the jurisdiction of the Star Chamber itself, and in regard to violence used by Mulsho in carrying away wood. The issue of the struggle is not altogether clear, but the Mulshos seem to have substantially succeeded, for they appear to have retained the enclosures they had already secured. Throughout it was to the King that the people looked for help; it was to him that 'under the Tudor Government, the peasantry con-'fidently looked for support against oppression,' † and the Star

* Select Cases in the Star Chamber, vol. ii. p. 61.
† Vol. ii. p. 90.

Chamber was therefore in these times a popular, if in its constitution it soon became, an irregular and uncertain tribunal.

In the sketch which has filled the previous pages, the relation of the Star Chamber to the vindication of popular rights in regard to land has been indicated. We may now note it as part of the machinery for carrying out the Tudor policy in regard to the food of the people—a policy which would to-day, in common jargon, be dubbed socialistic. The Court of Star Chamber was obviously created with a view of having at hand a legal tribunal which would have jurisdiction to enforce a policy which was certain to meet with checks and opposition, and which could not be successful unless these obstacles were overcome. But at any rate, far more even than in connexion with the ascertainment and vindication of such matters as rights of common, the Star Chamber was, in relation to means of livelihood, a popular tribunal, intended to safeguard the well-being of the lower classes.

The documents on this point which have survived the carelessness of custodians and the lapse of time are somewhat fragmentary, but they are none the less reliable. In 1542 an Information by the Attorney General was filed against Robert Danby of Walsingham in the county of Norfolk, Thomas Toly of Boston, and others. The offence alleged against them was that they had acted in defiance of the Act of 1539, which empowered the King, with the assent of the Council, to issue proclamations which should have the force of Acts of Parliament. The proclamation which had been disobeyed was one to prevent the export of cattle, corn, and other articles, such export being forbidden, because by reason of it the prices of cattle and corn were 'enhanced to great prices,' causing want of necessary sustenance to the King's subjects. To this information Toly delivered an answer which would not be out of place in a modern legal pleading. His defence was that the cargo was to be conveyed to Rye, and there sold if prices were good, otherwise it was to be carried on to Southampton or some port in the West Country. But contrary to these orders the master of the ship had taken it to Flanders. To this answer there was a reply by the Attorney-General. Of the result of the suit there are no documentary remains, but the pleadings which are left sufficiently indicate the purpose of the jurisdiction of the Star Chamber in the sixteenth century.

A memorandum, which is apparently only a draft note of a decree of the Court, shows this tribunal to have been part of the administrative machinery arising out of the legislation by which it was endeavoured to keep low the price of meat.

That legislation holds a place in the economic history of the sixteenth century, and can here be only alluded to with reference to the annals of the Star Chamber. The legislation on this subject during the reign of Henry VIII. began in 1529 by an Act whose object is sufficiently explained by its title—'An Act for the Bringing up and Rearing of Calves to increase 'the multitude of Cattle.' This statute was followed by other legislation with the same object, but it was impossible to counteract economic forces in this manner.

'In 1533 Parliament rose on the 15th of May, and on the 3rd of July the King and Council ordered the Mayor of London to proclaim the Act "for Fleshe to be sold by weight" in the usual manner and to fix up the authorised prices in public places. The three statutes, it was already patent, were ineffective to counteract economic conditions. The butchers were ready to complain that the prices charged by the graziers from whom they bought were such as to render them unable to retail at the statutory rates. Accordingly the proclamation calls upon the graziers, wholesale dealers, and farmers to sell at a price which shall enable the butchers to observe the statutory limitations and yet have a reasonable profit for themselves. Disobedience to the proclamation was menaced with punishment. Vague threats of this sort proving ineffective to the country graziers, the next step was taken in August, in the form of a circular to the justices in various counties, authorizing them to summon "all suche persons as be reputed . . . notable grasiours and that have any" quantity of meat in their hands, warning them to comply with the Act; and in case of obstinacy "we doo . . . auctorise you . . . to take vp and put to sale beef, mutton, and veal at the statute rate to supply the wants of the shire, and also of the city of London, as request shall be made to you."'*

It was about this time that the memorandum already referred to was drawn up. In a few words it depicts better than any description at once the jurisdiction of the new tribunal, and the internal policy of the King and his advisers. It bears the heading, 'Butchers of London *v.* Graziers,' and then it reads as follows:

'Memorandum that all suche grasiers grovers & feders of cattel as apperyd this daye before the kinges counceil in the Sterr Chamber as Westminster vppon the playnt of the bouchers in london were this said daye inyoyned on the kinges behalf, that they & euery of theym shall from hensforth bie no maner of fatt cattell to thentent to put the same ageyne to sale by the poll in grose to the bouchiers. And also that they shall conforme the prices of such cattell as they

* Select Cases in the Star Chamber, vol. ii. p. 45.

shall sell hereafter to the bouchers, so that the bouchers and other biers thereof intending to retayle the same by weight according to the acte of parliament made concernyng the same, may vtter and sell the said cattell to the kinge's subiectes according to the tenour & effect of the same acte. And in case any of the said persones being grasiers feders or buyars up of Fatt cattell do hereafter refuse to sell their cattell at such prices as ys ment by the said Acte, That then the boucher fyndyng hym self grevyd shall signefie vnto the kinge's councell the name or names of any such person or persones that so vsith, and the prices also of the cattell refusyd by theym. And it is further inioynned vnto the said persones, that they & euery of theym shall hereafter endevour theym selfes to help to furnysshe the markettes with cattell so that the kinge's subiectes may be provided thereof.' *

It is a remarkable and a striking fact that within a century a tribunal which had been intended to suppress anarchy, and which had been employed in a popular cause, and especially to safeguard the middle and poor classes of the nation, became the instrument of autocratically minded sovereigns to oppress the very persons whom no long time before it had defended.

Both Henry VII. and his son showed many of the attributes of Bolingbroke's ideal Patriot King—'to govern like the common 'father of his people' was the aim of each, and in their hands the Court of Star Chamber was a tribunal employed for the good of the people. But James I. and his son had weak understandings and strong prejudices; they imagined that the sovereign and the people were rival powers, with different interests, and we see the result in the doings of the Star Chamber in its latest stages.

A century is a short time in the life of a nation, yet the popular Court created by Henry VII. was abolished by force of the popular will in 1641, because it had become under the Stuarts an instrument of tyranny. But no less amazing and striking than this change of purpose in the jurisdiction of the Star Chamber, is the policy of the Stuarts in contrast with that of the Tudors as illustrated in the history of the Star Chamber. Nor could the ignorance of the Stuarts of English national character be better exemplified than by the fact that they could suppose that the people would allow a Court, which had been tolerated because it was a popular safeguard, to become a permanent scourge for their backs. It was unthinkable that a tribunal intended for the trial of purely ordinary criminal offences should in time become one only existing to

* Select Cases in the Star Chamber, vol. ii. p. 205.

increase the power of the prerogative of the Crown. In the age of the Stuarts the original purpose of the Star Chamber had indeed quickly changed. It was not so much a case such as that of Sir John Holles and Sir John Wentworth, who were fined and imprisoned by the Star Chamber because they had asked Weston at the time of his execution for participation in the murder of Sir Thomas Overbury whether or not he was guilty, which illustrated the difference as one like that of Chambers. This merchant of London was condemned to pay a fine of 2000*l.*, and to be imprisoned until his fault had been duly acknowledged. Chambers was one of the merchants who refused to pay tonnage and poundage. Those who had done so were brought before the Council in September, 1628, and Chambers, who was an outspoken and courageous man, had flung out that 'Merchants 'are in no part of the world so screwed and wrung as in England. 'In Turkey they have more encouragement.' Thereupon he was committed to the Marshalsea prison for contempt of Court —'the Court being of opinion that the words spoken were a 'comparing of His Majesty's Government with the Government 'of the Turks, intending thereby to make the people believe 'that His Majesty's happy Government may be termed Turkish 'tyranny.' * On this absurd charge as well as, though it was not avowed, to endeavour to induce him to pay taxes which had not been shown to be lawful this sturdy citizen of London found himself sent to prison by the very tribunal to which his ancestors had been wont to look for redress of their grievances. It is in connexion with such charges as these that the wide difference between the Star Chamber of the Tudor and the Stuart Kings is so marked. In the volume of the State Trials, which contains the case of Chambers, that of Leighton will be found not many pages away. Leighton was an able, scholarly, and well-meaning man, but he was unquestionably a fanatic, and his petition to the Commons, which as they were not sitting was never presented, and which was signed by some five hundred persons and printed, was a violent attack on the episcopacy of the English Church. It was in fact a pamphlet entitled 'An Appeal to Parliament, or a Plea against Prelacy.' Many of the censures contained in it were well deserved, but the language was very unmeasured. For his offence Leighton was brought before the Star Chamber on a charge of sedition, condemned to a fine of 10,000*l.*, to be pilloried, lose his ears and other equally brutal punishments—two of his judges being Laud and Neal, Bishop of Worcester, who were in fact also

* State Trials, vol. iii. p. 374.

his accusers.* Long before these important cases the Star Chamber had become a means of ecclesiastical and regal tyranny and an instrument for the repression of free speech, though men who did not suffer by its action commented on its proceedings with the indifference with which they referred to daily occurrences in England. For instance, in the correspondence preserved at Longleat is a gossiping letter written by one Thomas Lorken, in 1618, nearly a quarter of a century, be it remembered, before the Court was abolished. The first part of it is filled with news about Raleigh, and then the writer gives his correspondent another bit of intelligence:

'Upon Friday last,' he continues, 'a censure passed in the Starre Chamber upon one Trask, sometimes a Minister of London, for certayne Jewish opinions by him mainteiyned and divulged, as that Satterday is the true Sabbath and ought to be celebrated, not Sunday, that it is not lawfull to eate swine's flesh, and that men ought to absteyne from bloud, and the like, inveighing against our bishops under the termes of bloudy butchers, which in publique Court he offered to make good for that half a yeer together they had kept him in prison with no other allowance than bread and water, whilest in the interim Popists priests were there suffred to feast and banquet, and that indeed was his fare, but of swine's flesh he might have eaten his fill every day, for so it was ordred. His punishment was to be whipt, to have his eares nailed to the pillory, emprisonment during the King's pleasure, and a fine of 1000*l.* set on his head.' †

Now let us go back to the time of the Henrys, and note two simple cases of contempt of Court—that of Idele *v.* Abbot of St. Bennett's Holme in 1495,‡ and Treherne *v.* Harcourt in 1503.§

Thomas Idele was a servitor in the Star Chamber, who, having obtained a letter under the Privy Seal against the Abbot of St. Bennett's Holme for injuries done to his wife, in due course served it on the defendant. The sequel is most realistic when narrated in Idele's own words:

'It is so gracioux lord, that at the deliueraunce of your said lettres to the said Abbot in the presence of v or (illegible) of his brethren monkes of the same house he received it without reuerence

* For a full account of this historical episode see Gardiner's 'History of England,' vol. vii. p. 55, and State Trials, vol. iii. p. 383.

† Hist. Man. Com. Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Marquis of Bath, vol. ii. p. 67.

‡ Select Cases in the Star Chamber, vol. i. p. 50.

§ Ibid. p. 162.

by putting off his bonet or otherwise and whan he had it, threw it from him into a wyndow in grete angre and or euer he opened it or read it, he entreated your said Oratour to haue taken it home with him agayn, and offred him a Noble so to haue doone; Which to do your said Oratour vtterly refused and for the bringing thidre of your said lettres & for noon other cause, your said Oratour was right sore & ferefully manasshed & thretened by one of his Monkes to bete kill & sle to thentent to make other tobe ware of bringing thidre eny priue Seales hereaftre saying that the best knight in the Shire durst nat haue doone such a dede vnto them. And so youre said Oratour departed thens in grete fere & jeopardie of his life, beseching your grace to take such wey & direccion therein for the mysdemeanying of the said Abbot & of his said Monke as by your highenesse shal be thought consonaunt to reason & good conscience. At the reuerence of God & in wey of charitie.'

Let us now turn from the misdeeds of the Abbot to those of the landowner, one of ancient family—the Harcourts of Nuneham in Oxfordshire. In this case two servants of the Bishop of Llandaff served two writs of subpœna returnable in the Star Chamber on two servants of Sir Robert Harcourt. Instead of accepting service they threw the writs into the street and struck Treherne and Full, the two servants of the Bishop, and on the following Sunday more of Sir Robert's servants came to Eynesham, and attempted to slay them 'for executing the 'King's commandment.' The injured persons complained that no law, justice, nor equity could be administered in Oxfordshire on account of the behaviour of Sir Robert and his servants. It must be admitted that Sir Robert Harcourt did not, at this juncture, show much of the courage or haughtiness of a great lord, for in his answer to the Bill of Complaint he denied that Tytt had been his servant for many years, and therefore he prayed to be dismissed from the cause.

In both these cases we see a powerful individual, the first ecclesiastical and the second lay, promptly proceeded against. Unfortunately in neither case do the records complete the legal tale, but the humble tone of Sir Robert Harcourt's plea sufficiently shows his fear of the power of the Star Chamber, just as the incidents, out of which the proceedings in each instance arose, indicate the lawless spirit which was abroad, and the necessity for exceptional remedies. This necessity is in fact a complete justification of the policy of Henry VII. in obtaining statutory authority for a Court which was intended to be an auxiliary to the common law Courts, and to the equitable jurisdiction of the Chancellor. The Court was not as Dr. Busch somewhat too strongly puts it, for the 'subjection of

'the aristocracy': * it was no doubt to keep the aristocracy and powerful ecclesiastics within bounds, but it was equally important to restrain their servants and retainers, and generally to restore law and order in a country which the Wars of the Roses had thrown into a condition of chronic disturbance. This policy was at once sagacious and effective, but the very effectiveness of the machinery made it, when there was a sovereign on the throne who had neither capacity nor popular sympathies, as successful as a means of tyranny as it had before been a means of justice. The extreme efficiency of the machine is in fact some excuse for the actions of James I. and Charles I. They found this instrument ready to their hand. Each was politically short-sighted, and neither recognised that the Court of Star Chamber had become an anachronism. Being rather stupid human beings, whom fate had made Kings of England, it was natural that they should utilise an instrument at once powerful, simple, and well tried, though neither perceived that its use must recoil on those who continued it in times to which, and for purposes for which, it was unfit.

An excrescence on the immemorial common law Courts of England, no special pleading by subservient lawyers in the age of the Stuarts, when the ordinary Courts had regained their efficiency, could retain a tribunal which had long outlived its purpose, when national feeling was thoroughly aroused against it. Thus an institution which had once been popular was abolished by the Long Parliament in 1641, after an existence of barely a century and a half when it had become an intolerable engine of oppression.

In succeeding ages undue attention has been given to the later developement of the Court of Star Chamber, and so its name has become synonymous with a tyrannical exercise of the royal prerogative, and with judicial partiality and misdoing. The excellent work of the Court at its inception in restoring law and order throughout England, so that presently the ancient Courts of the Realm were renewed in vigour, has on the contrary been, in some degree, overlooked. But if we take an impartial survey of the rise and fall of this institution, it becomes evident that, interesting though it may be, in the legal history of England it is of greater importance for its influence on the political and social welfare of the people in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

* Busch, 'England under the Tudors,' vol. i. p. 267.

Art. IV.—THE POETICS OF ARISTOTLE.

1. *Aristotle on the Art of Poetry,* a revised text with critical introduction, translation and commentary. By Ingram Bywater. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1909.
2. *The Poetics of Aristotle,* translated from Greek into English and from Arabic into Latin, with a revised text, introduction, commentary, glossary and onomasticon. By D. S. Margoliouth. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1911.

English scholarship has in recent years done something like justice to Aristotle's 'Poetics,' and in this respect it has been returning to an earlier tradition; for Twining and Tyrwhitt were the scholars who contributed most in the eighteenth century to the criticism and elucidation of this celebrated classical text. During the succeeding century the impulse for the most part came from Germany: but in our own generation the names of Butcher, Bywater and Margoliouth represent greater merits with regard both to text and illustration than can be credited to any other country. The work of the first of these three, the loss of whom we are still deploring, is too well known, and its merits too widely recognised, to need further commendation here. Our concern, so far as we undertake the function of reviewers, is with the harvest of the last few years.

In Mr. Bywater's edition we have the ripe fruit of many years of labour upon this text, and it gives us for the first time a full and satisfactory commentary, with large store of illustrations, both from the other writings of Aristotle and from Greek literature generally, a piece of work which displays all the learning and thoroughness which were to be expected from its author, and which will not easily be superseded. The editor maintains the essential integrity of the text which has come down to us, and shows how unsafe it is to assume that what Aristotle wrote must have been always consistent and logical; but he does not decline the help of emendation where passages seem to be undoubtedly corrupt. He abstains somewhat rigorously from entering into discussion of Aristotle's theories of poetry and art, and he seems to have a rather exaggerated distrust of all such enquiries, and to hold that Aristotle himself had perhaps never systematically thought out his ideas on the subject. This, we are bound to say, seems to us very unlikely; but it would be ungracious to quarrel

with what Mr. Bywater has given us merely because it is not something else, and taken as a whole his edition is a model of sound scholarship and good judgement.

This is not quite the kind of praise which can be given to the work of Mr. Margoliouth, brilliant and suggestive as it is, but at least we must acknowledge that it is free from revolutionary dealings with the text. He gives us indeed a text in which conservatism is carried to an extreme, whilst the authority of the Arabic version, which he was perhaps the first in this country to invoke, seems to be spoken of sometimes almost with contempt. When Mr. Margoliouth first wrote on this subject, five and twenty years ago, in his 'Analecta Orientalia,' the established theory was that for the Greek text of the 'Poetics' there existed only one original authority, the Paris manuscript written in the eleventh century, and that all the other existing manuscripts were copies of this, more or less ingeniously amended by Italian Renaissance scholars. From that time however it was recognised that the Arabic version, which is older than any existing Greek manuscript of the 'Poetics,' had to be taken seriously into account, and the fact that this seemed to support many of the variations found in the later Greek copies suggested the idea that some of these represented a text independent of the Paris manuscript. Having thrown out this tub to the whales, Mr. Margoliouth left them to amuse themselves with it, and when he himself returned to the subject, he went to work in a different direction. The later Greek copies, about which so many confident assertions were made, had never been fully collated, or at least no account of them had been given to the public on which a proper judgment could be based. Mr. Margoliouth proceeded to examine practically all the known manuscripts, twenty-three in number, and he at least obtained proof that they are not all copies of the Paris manuscript. One, belonging to the fourteenth century, 'contains a line and a half of Aristotelian Greek, 'the genuineness of which is attested by the Arabic, and which 'has fallen out of all other MSS.' Mr. Margoliouth comes to the conclusion that there are five independent groups, and taking one leading example of each, he gives us all the principal variations of these five copies, together with a literal translation into Latin of the Arabic version. Thus he claims to have supplied us with the whole of the tradition, both Eastern and Western, and the result, in the editor's judgement, is that conjectural emendation is almost entirely excluded, and it remains to find an altogether new way of dealing with the admitted difficulties. It is interesting to observe how coolly

he can throw over the authority of the Arabic version when it suits him to do so, with the passing suggestion, if we understand him rightly, that the Greek text on which it was ultimately founded had probably been altered and interpolated by Byzantine editors, and that its agreement with the Renaissance copies may as often as not be due to coincidence of conjectural emendation. This air of easy indifference, however, must not make us overlook the value of the contribution which Mr. Margoliouth has made to our knowledge by the Latin translation of the Arabic which he now supplies. We knew from what he had already told us that it was no very accurate reproduction of the original, but we had hardly realised the full measure of its absurdity. The Syriac version on which it was founded belonged perhaps to the sixth century, and the Arabic translation itself dates from some little time before 932 A.D., for it is referred to in a debate which took place in that year between Abu Bashar, the author of it, and a rival grammarian, a debate in which 'both parties assume that the whole of 'Greek literature has perished, and is preserved only in Syriac 'translations.' Precisely how far the ridiculous errors in this version are due to Abu Bashar himself, it is of course impossible to say; but the Syriac translator, if we may judge from the short specimen of his work which has been preserved, was capable of almost anything; and in particular the frequent mistakes about proper names, evidently made by someone with the Greek text before him, must assuredly be set down to him. He must have been a man almost absolutely ignorant of Greek literature, for such titles as 'Margites' or 'Choephoroe,' and such names as Epicharmus and Agathon, conveyed no ideas to his mind, and it was probably he who imagined that Iphigeneia was a nun and Odysseus an evangelist, false or true.* However this may be, the result of the combined effort is almost incredibly bad, and there is hardly a paragraph in the Latin translation given by Mr. Margoliouth which would be intelligible to a reader who had no access to the original. It is worth while perhaps to quote some of its absurdities. Aristotle says: 'That which by its presence or absence makes

*Aristotle, making reference to the nineteenth book of the Odyssey, says, οἷον ἐν τῷ Ὀδυσσεῖ τῷ ψευδαγγέλῳ. Apparently the first translator thought this meant, 'as in the history of Odysseus the false evangelist,' and Abu Bashar, who was a Christian, converted what he took to be a pagan insult into a more reverent form of expression, writing 'in eo quod scriptum est ex historia Odyssei euangelistae illius sancti.'

'no perceptible difference, is no real part of the whole.' The Arabic has: 'That which produces no effect whether it be near 'or far off, and causes the whole to be brought to nothing, 'is a part of that whole.' Aristotle speaking of dramatic coincidences, adds in illustration: 'As the statue of Mitys 'in Argos slew him who was the cause of the death of Mitys, 'by falling upon him when he was looking on at the games'; for which the Arabic gives us: 'As was the case of Andreas 'the son of Mitys, for he had slain in Argos the man who was 'the cause of the death of Mitys, seeing him when he had 'fallen.' Again, speaking of stage recognitions, Aristotle says: 'The fourth kind is by reasoning, as in the "Choephoroe," 'where it is argued: Someone like me has come: but no-one 'is like me except Orestes: therefore Orestes has come.' The readers of the Arabic have to be content with this: 'The 'fourth is that which occurs to the mind, as for example: 'Someone has come who is like a washer of corpses: but no 'like person has come except Orestes: it is he therefore who 'has come.' Of such renderings the Arabic version is full, and it is no wonder that the readers of it came to the conclusion that it embodied a highly mysterious doctrine, intelligible only to the initiated; and some perhaps learnt it by heart in the hope that thereby they might gradually absorb the wisdom which it doubtless contained, while others passed it by as hopelessly unintelligible.

To Orientals it would seem nothing strange that a philosopher should deliberately write a book in such a style that it could not be comprehended by anyone without special instruction. But it is somewhat surprising to find Mr. Margoliouth seriously maintaining that the 'Poetics' as originally written by Aristotle was a book of this description. It is, he tells us, an esoteric work. No doubt: but so are all the most important of Aristotle's writings; that is, they are written in a philosophical and not in a popular style. This applies to the 'Ethics,' the 'Politics,' the 'Physics' and the 'Metaphysics,' as well as to the 'Rhetoric' and the 'Poetics.' For the full understanding of each of these treatises some acquaintance with Aristotle's system and with his use of technical terms is required; but they are not therefore esoteric in the Oriental sense, constructed like puzzles, so as to be of no use to any but privileged persons. Aristotle is often careless in his statements, with the carelessness of a teacher addressing a circle of hearers who know something of his system and will supply the necessary qualifications. 'He does not write with the fear of the critics 'before his eyes. He assumes an audience already familiar

'with the general drift of his thought, able to fill in what 'is unsaid and to place his rules in proper light and perspective.'* Aristotle in fact was no impeccable logician: inconsistency of thought and looseness of terminology are to be found occasionally in all his works, as is well shown by Mr. Bywater in his introduction. Mr. Margoliouth on the other hand suggests that the apparent carelessness is in fact a part of a deep design, and before approaching the text of the 'Poetics' he undertakes to discuss the manner in which 'a book in a well-known 'language about a familiar subject can be rendered inaccessible.' The method suggested is that of an elaborate system of interdependence, of such a nature that no part of the system is intelligible without knowledge of the whole. It is assumed that in esoteric writings there must be absolute philosophical consistency and the greatest possible brevity, for the work will have to be committed to memory before it can be even dimly understood; while a little later we are told also that in the esoteric style the author will often use a word in several different senses in the same paragraph expressly to mislead the uninitiated reader and to guard the cryptogram from detection. The mischievous effects of such suggestions as applied to Aristotle are soon visible. Evidently on this principle, if there are several ways of interpreting a passage, the true one will be the least obvious, and Mr. Margoliouth proceeds to illustrate this by a series of examples. There is an abundance of ingenuity and of subtlety in his interpretations, but we venture to think rather a small amount of truth. Aristotle begins an argument thus: 'Since the 'objects of imitation are men in action, and the men must be 'either good or bad, for character mainly follows this distinction, 'men being different in character according to vice or virtue,' etc. The statement is a loose one, but with a little good will in supplying qualifications, we find it easily intelligible. Mr. Margoliouth however will have none of it on these terms. According to him, the first clause (as apprehended by the ordinary reader) is clearly false, for the imitation may be of a dead man or a landscape; the second is even more grossly untrue, for most men are neither good nor bad; the third is unnecessary, and the fourth obscure. When a great philosopher produces what is apparently mere nonsense, it is our duty to consider whether the fault may not be rather in our intelligence than in his statement. Accordingly, by assuming a quite incredible

* Butcher, 'Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art,' 3rd edit. p. 329.

structure of sentences, by proposing a new theory of the use of alternative conjunctions in Greek, and by introducing a technicality of logic where nothing of the kind can have been intended, he leads us to a meaning not very unlike that which we had suspected from the first, but by paths which might have conducted us almost anywhere. In several cases quite new and original renderings are thus produced, to which it is wholly impossible to assent, or attempts are made by subtlety of interpretation to defend the readings of the manuscripts in cases where, to the ordinary perception, they seem to be undoubtedly corrupt. On the whole, while admiring the editor's ingenuity and learning, we are quite unable to accept his conclusions as to the method pursued by Aristotle in this treatise.

But apart from this, the essay 'On the Esoteric Style' contains much that is of interest, and in particular a new suggestion is made for the elucidation of the 'catharsis' (the word cannot be translated without begging the question as to its meaning) which is to be effected by tragedy. From a passage in the 'Politics,' the bearing of which on this subject has been appreciated at least since the time of Robortello, we know that Aristotle regarded the treatment of pity and fear, which is here spoken of, as analogous to the cure of religious 'enthusiasm,' which is allayed, he observes, by those very melodies which tend to produce it. Similarly, by exciting the emotions of pity and fear under certain conditions, we are able, he says, to effect a 'catharsis' of these emotions, that is, apparently, if we may borrow Milton's phrase, 'to temper and reduce them to just measure.' It has been commonly assumed in modern times, as it was by the critics of the Italian Renaissance, that the metaphor is from the use of a purge, and that Aristotle meant either that these emotions were to be purged away altogether, being regarded as merely painful, or that the excess of them which the experiences of actual life is apt to produce was to be got rid of by some process of purgation. Neither of these ideas can be regarded as quite satisfactory, and indeed the homœopathic treatment which is suggested is not very consistent with the idea of a purge. Mr. Margoliouth argues that the metaphor is derived rather from the traditional treatment of madness, and, referring to passages in Aristotle's 'Problems' and elsewhere, he makes it seem possible that Aristotle had in his mind rather an adjustment of temperature in the bodily and mental constitution than an evacuation of troublesome matter, and that 'catharsis' here meant simply a restoration of that

equilibrium between heat and cold upon which the due balance of the emotional nature was thought to depend. The idea is ingenious, and at first sight rather attractive; but Mr. Margoliouth's citations and arguments do not entirely bear out his theory. The passage in the 'Problems,' to which he first refers, contains no hint of the homoeopathic treatment which he seems to find there; and it is a very bold statement that no respectable writer of Greek 'ever used "katharsis" in 'the sense of *erleichtende Entladung*,' unless Galen and all the other medical writers are to be excluded from the list of respectable writers of Greek. Mr. Margoliouth however seems to have shown that the word is actually used by Aristotle and others for the restoration of mental sanity or physical health, and the kind of adjustment which this would imply is undoubtedly suitable to the meaning here, and suggests more clearly than any other explanation the idea which seems to be needed, of a correction both of excess and of defect in the emotions. 'Tragic pity must not only purify the soul 'of him who has too much pity, but also of him who has too 'little; tragic fear must purify both the soul of him who does 'not fear any kind of misfortune, and that of him who is terrified 'by every misfortune, even the most distant and improbable.' * But there is no certainty about these things; and after all it is not improbable that the idea in Aristotle's mind was that of purgation, and it may very possibly have been suggested, like so much else, by Plato, who uses the term in the 'Sophist' of the intellectual effect produced by dialectic, and expressly refers in that connexion to the use of purges by the physician. Since the defect of heat, for example, is regarded by Aristotle as an excess of cold, and *vice versa*, the purging away of excess of all kinds would remedy also the cases of defect. After all, the important point is not the question what precise medical analogy was in Aristotle's mind, but what is the actual nature of the process with regard to the emotions of which he is speaking. Fortunately there can be little doubt with regard to this. The presentation in tragedy of objects which move pity and fear is intended to bring these emotions in the spectator to a certain degree of intensity, and at the same time to restrain them within the limits which the conditions of art prescribe.

In this particular instance, while hesitating to accept Mr. Margoliouth's suggestion, we regard it nevertheless as an interesting and valuable one, and it will doubtless receive attention from scholars. For the most part, however, though

* Lessing, 'Hamburgische Dramaturgie,' No. 78.

his ingenuity fascinates us as we read, the interpretations which he proposes fail to carry lasting conviction. The merit of his book lies after all mainly in the new material which he has given us, the Latin translation from the Arabic, and the selected and classified readings from the later Greek manuscripts of the 'Poetics.'

There is certainly no sign apparent that the interest in this unique document is slackening, or that its importance is underrated in an age which has especially applied itself to literary criticism. It is true that our estimate of it has been affected by the historical method. We no longer regard it as a body of abstract propositions to be judged of by themselves: we endeavour to place it in its proper surroundings and to give it an appropriate atmosphere. By bringing out more clearly the relation on the one hand of Aristotle to Plato, and on the other of the 'Poetics' to Aristotle's other writings, modern criticism has done much to further the better understanding of this treatise, though in some respects the modern view is little else than a reversion to that of the excellent scholars of the Italian Renaissance; and it is better understood now than formerly, that as in the 'Ethics' and the 'Politics,' so also here, Aristotle's conclusions are practical rather than theoretical, the recorded results of experience rather than rules of universal validity, while at the same time it is remembered that the experience was confined to one literature and a single language. In the eighteenth century even so great a critic as Lessing declared the 'Poetics' to be as infallible as the Elements of Euclid, and maintained that tragedy could not depart a step from the plumb-line of Aristotle without departing so far from its own perfection. Certainly few books are less like the Elements of Euclid, either as regards infallibility of conclusions or orderly sequence of reasoning. A formal definition of poetry is absolutely lacking, and we cannot with any certainty construct one from the indications that are given. We do not know whether Aristotle regarded metre as an essential of poetry,* and he has not only left us without precise explanation of the important word which we inadequately render 'imitation,' but he has evidently used it, if not in six different senses, as is maintained by one of his early Italian critics,† at least in

* The passage in which he deals with this matter is corrupt, no doubt, but he seems in any case to have expressed himself ambiguously.

† Patrizzi, 'Della Poetica' (1586).

as many as three. In his celebrated definition of tragedy he makes no proper distinction between the essential and the unessential elements, and he gives no explanation whatever of the technical term upon which the whole depends. At one time he tells us that action includes character, and at another that tragedies may consist of action alone without character, and indeed that most modern tragedies are of this kind. In discussing the plots of plays he uses the same word within a few lines for single as opposed to double, and for simple as opposed to complex. He tells us on one page that Euripides is undoubtedly right in giving unhappy endings to his plays and that for this reason he is felt to be the most tragic of dramatists, and on another that the tragedy with an unhappy ending is not to be considered the best. Disorder in the method of treatment is almost as evident as inconsistency of statement; and there are serious omissions and deficiencies which cannot be entirely accounted for by the supposed loss of the second book. Aristotle was attracted to that side of literary criticism which lent itself to systematic and logical treatment, and there are tolerably clear indications that he was inclined to treat the more elevated forms of lyrical poetry with comparative neglect, and indeed to regard lyrical poetry in general as a mere ornament of the drama. Pindar and Sappho are left entirely without recognition, and the poetical qualities which most moved the admiration of the author of the treatise 'Of the Sublime' were precisely those which most readily escaped Aristotle's logical analysis.

And yet, when all reserves have been made, Aristotle's critical work remains the most important that has been done by any single man; and though doubtless it embodies to some extent the results of scholastic discussions, we must treat it as individual work, both because we have no trustworthy record of previous developement on the same lines, and because there is clearly impressed upon it the stamp of an individual mind. One predecessor indeed he had, whose influence must be taken into account at every turn: but Plato, though he had contributed much that was stimulating and suggestive, had left no systematic treatment of the subject, and his attitude towards the 'imitative' arts was either actually hostile, or very doubtfully sympathetic. Indeed it is not difficult to recognise as a main purpose of Aristotle's treatise the object of vindicating poetry from the aspersions cast upon it by his master. It is true that the name of Plato is not mentioned in the 'Poetics,' but we know from other sources that Aristotle had elsewhere carried on a lively polemic on the

subject, which was especially directed against Plato, and we have here his mature conclusions. Of set purpose he accepts terms used by Plato, and vindicates for them a higher meaning. The words 'mimesis' and 'mimetic' for example, which as applied to art are used by Plato generally in a depreciatory sense, are by Aristotle ennobled and freed from reproach, in spite of some inconsistency in his use of them. For Plato, at least in the 'Republic,' poetry is the imitation of an imitation, at the third remove from the truth, having no direct contact with the ideal. For Aristotle it is an 'imitation' indeed, but no mere reproduction of outward appearances: it imitates not what is, but what ought to be, the better, the universal, the idea at which Nature is aiming, but to which owing to material obstacles she cannot always attain. Poetry therefore is nobler and truer than history, which is not properly speaking a form of imitation at all. 'Imitation' in fact is no longer regarded as a mere mechanical reproduction of human life and action; it is essentially an ideal representation, based on perception of the reasonableness of Nature's work as a whole, in spite of the unreason which may show itself in this or that particular event or series of events. Poetry has to do with the universal and not with the particular. '"Imitation," so understood, 'is a creative act. It is the expression of the concrete thing 'under an image which answers to its true idea. To seize 'the universal, and to reproduce it in simple and sensuous 'form, is not to reflect a reality already familiar through 'sense perceptions; rather it is a rivalry of nature, a 'completion of her unfulfilled purposes, a correction of her 'failures.' *

This theoretical vindication of poetry from the slur cast upon it by Plato is the first great merit of the 'Poetics.' And next comes the assertion on practical grounds of the right of poetry to a place in the social system, from which Plato had expelled it. The appeal of poetry is to the emotions, and the emotions ought to be repressed rather than encouraged—so ran the reasoning of Plato. Quiet endurance of calamity, for example, is the manly part; but the natural hunger after sorrow and weeping is satisfied by the poets; and our better nature is taken unawares, because the sorrow is another's, and so from the evil of others the fruit of evil is reaped by ourselves: the feeling of pity, which has gathered strength at the sight of the misfortunes of others, will not be

* Butcher, 'Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art,' p. 154.

repressed in our own.* It is this which forms the 'heaviest 'count' in Plato's indictment of the poets, and it is here that Aristotle joins issue, and though we have lost the full statement of his position, yet the main lines of it are fairly clear. The emotions of pity and fear, which are especially roused by tragedy, are essential parts of human nature, not to be altogether repressed, but to be kept within due limits, both as regards excess and defect. The true remedy for excess or defect in these and other emotions is that we should experience them pleasurably within the limits which are prescribed by art. The excess in our emotions arises from the fact that they are excited by particular accidents, and that the universal law which rules these accidents is for the moment out of our sight. Poetry which shows us the universal in the particular frees us from this condition, and helps us to attain in regard to the conduct of our life something of that balance and harmony of feeling which belongs to the enjoyment of a work of art. It is true that Aristotle does not tell us in so many words that this was his meaning, but it is an explanation which is consonant with his general view of poetry and with the analogy which he suggests in the 'Politics' of the treatment by music of 'enthusiasm.' The only intelligible explanation which we can give of this treatment is surely that the lawless and excessive emotion is to be brought within due limits by the excitement of a similar emotion under artistic conditions. Even orgiastic melodies suggest the idea of law by the mere fact that they are musical compositions, and the suggestion required for this purpose is not the idea of law alone, but of law associated with the particular emotion.

Aristotle's idea then of the ethical object of poetry and fine art is not that they give moral teaching, but that they bring the emotional system into a condition which is favourable to healthy moral action. To say that for Aristotle poetry has no ethical aims, and that he makes pleasure the sole object of art, is to misrepresent his position. It is true that the restoration of the emotional balance, like the return to physical health, is attended with pleasure, and that Aristotle accordingly speaks sometimes of the pleasure which is proper to tragedy, and of the dramatist as aiming at this pleasure: but if pleasure had been the primary object, it would surely have been mentioned in the definition of tragedy as the end to be achieved. In general the activities which constitute 'happiness' are accompanied by pleasure, but pleasure is not the object;

* Plato, 'Republic,' x. 606.

and it is abundantly clear that Aristotle's view of poetry is not independent of ethical considerations.

It is probable that he would have agreed in this respect with Plato's argument in the 'Laws,' that the pleasure given by the imitative arts is an accompanying charm, but that equal proportions, and not pleasure, give them truth and rightness. Indeed the position taken up by Plato in the 'Laws' on this subject, so much less absolute than that which is expressed in the 'Republic,' furnishes in some respects a real approximation to the Aristotelian doctrine. When he speaks of the use of wine under due regulation for the production of certain emotional conditions, and closely connects this gift of Dionysus with those other gifts of choric harmony and rhythm for which mankind is indebted to the same god, we may surely accept this as a partial and tentative retractation of the earlier view; and the reception of the tragic poets who are supposed to seek admission to the ideal state is now much less discouraging then it had been earlier.

'And if any of the serious or tragic poets, as they are termed, come to us and say "O strangers, may we go to your city and country, or may we not, and shall we bring with us our poetry,—what is your will about these matters?" I think that our answer should be as follows: "Best of strangers," we will say to them, "we also according to our ability are tragic poets, and our tragedy the best and noblest; for our whole state is an imitation of the best and noblest life, which we affirm to be indeed the very truth of tragedy. You are poets and we are poets, your rivals and antagonists in the noblest of dramas. . . . Do not then suppose that we shall all in a moment allow you to erect your stage in the agora or introduce the fair voice of your actors, speaking above our own, and permit you to harangue our women and children, and the mass of mankind, about our institutions, in language other than our own, and very often the opposite of our own. . . . Wherefore, O ye sons and scions of the softer Muses, first of all show your songs to the magistrates, and let them compare them with our own, and if they are the same or better, we will give you a chorus; but if not, then my friends, we cannot."' *

This is merely dramatic censorship; there is no foregone conclusion in the negative with regard to the drama, as in the 'Republic': if the poets can make good their cause—that is, show the wholesome tendency of their art—they may be admitted; and it is this cause that Aristotle undertakes to vindicate.

---

* Plato, 'Laws,' vii. 817. (Jowett's translation.)

In reading the 'Poetics' no one can fail to be struck by the emphasis with which the author asserts the vital principle of artistic unity, and the persistence with which he returns to it. The connexion however between this and the terms of his celebrated definition of tragedy has not been sufficiently observed. The most interesting point about the definition is the fact that it is expressed, at least partly, in terms of emotion—that is, with a view to the producing of a particular emotional result. The merit of a work of art therefore is made to depend mainly on its effectiveness in producing a certain result, together with the pleasure which belongs to this result, not any casual pleasure. Consequently all the available means must be concentrated towards this single end, and tragedy is pronounced to be a higher kind of literary art than epic poetry mainly because by its form it favours this concentration. However this may be, nothing in the 'Poetics' has had more importance for literary criticism than the uncompromising assertions which it contains of the principle of unity.

The dictum about the relative importance of plot and character, which to some modern critics has seemed to be a hard saying, is of course merely a corollary from this. Plot means action, and action displays character; but the character must not be developed as an end in itself, it must be used in subordination to the general scheme, and with due relation to the end at which the whole composition aims: that is, the whole is of more importance than any of its parts. Similarly the poet is much more a poet in virtue of his plot than of his verses, though the name poet originally refers, no doubt, to his function as a maker of verse.

In other matters the lineage of Aristotle's critical ideas is less easily traceable. The question raised about the character of the tragic hero has a rather scholastic appearance, but we should like to attribute to Aristotle individually the rule that the catastrophe in tragedy should if possible be the result, not of a great crime, such as springs from real badness of character, but of an error arising from ignorance or from some venial defect of character, and we readily supplement his list of examples with the names of Hamlet, Othello, and Lear. Another pregnant saying which might well be illustrated from Shakespeare is the maxim that the probable impossibility is to be preferred by the dramatist to the unconvincing possibility. The subject of technique in tragedy especially interests him: he insists, for example, that for genuine effectiveness the tragic reversal of fortune should be combined as closely as possible with the

'recognition' or discovery, and that both should arise naturally out of the action of the plot; that the marvellous must be made to have the appearance of design; that the plot with a double catastrophe, like that of the 'Odyssey,' with rewards for the good and punishment for the bad, must be avoided in tragedy. The practical advice is given to the dramatist, while engaged in his composition, to endeavour to feel the emotions which he wishes to arouse, and with this end to act the story himself with the appropriate gestures of his personages.

It is remarkable how much the 'Poetics' stands alone, and how little influence it seems to have had upon later Greek and Latin criticism. We can with difficulty trace references to it in the later Greek literature. How is it that a book of so remarkable a character, so valuable and so suggestive, fell out of sight apparently in classical times, while its companion treatise, the 'Rhetoric,' remained always in full view? Did Dionysius of Halicarnassus, did Horace (or his Greek original), did Longinus even, know the 'Poetics'? If so, why are there practically no traces of such knowledge? If not, how did this come about? These are questions which it is not easy to answer. Diogenes Laertius records the existence of the treatise, apparently in two books, in the third century of our era. Iamblichus in the fourth century, and Simplicius in the sixth, make passing allusions apparently to the lost second book, which must therefore have survived almost down to the time of the Syriac translation; but for any such general influence upon criticism as we should have expected if the book had been generally known we shall look in vain in the classical period. The absence of references to the essay 'Of the Sublime' has been remarked upon as noteworthy, but that case is entirely different. Longinus (if it be Longinus) deals only with a portion of the subject, and handles this in a somewhat personal and particular manner, without laying down general principles except by implication: Aristotle's work, whatever may be its imperfections and shortcomings, is at least systematic in form and goes to the root of the matter. It is true that the 'Poetics' was translated into Syriac and from thence into Arabic, but the result obtained by this process was, as we have seen, almost unintelligible, and those Orientals who fished in what Mr. Margoliouth has elsewhere called the turbid pool of Abu Bashar can hardly have caught many of the ideas of the original. Hermannus indeed, who translated Aristotle from Arabic into Latin in the thirteenth century, passed over this treatise as too hard for him, and substituted

the summary of Averroes, which was still less like Aristotle, omitting of course the illustrations from Arabic poetry which Averroes had been imprudent enough to add.*

A very different fortune was in store for the 'Poetics' in the times that were to come. Having reached the sixteenth century it became for the Renaissance what the philosophical works had been for the Middle Ages, the foundation of all reasoning on the subject of which it treats, and Aristotle had a new and unexpected triumph. As Mr. Spingarn points out in his interesting book on the literary criticism of the Renaissance,† that very year, 1536, in which Peter Ramus advanced before the University of Paris his celebrated thesis, 'that all Aristotle's doctrines are false,' 'quaecunque ab Aris-'totele dicta essent commentitia esse,' was the date of publication of the Latin translation of the 'Poetics' by Alessandro dei Pazzi, on which the critical influence of that treatise may be said to be based.‡ There was a real compensation here for the loss of authority elsewhere. The science of literary criticism sprang into being fully equipped, and the equipment was supplied, it may almost be said, entirely by the 'Poetics.' Indeed many of the earlier Italian critical discussions are actually in the form of commentaries upon Aristotle's text, and those that are not in this form depend upon Aristotle not less completely for the basis on which their theories are founded. As yet his supposed rules had laid no dead hand upon literature; the influence was a vivifying one, and continued to be so until it had passed beyond the bounds of Italy. The book had waited long, and in the meantime it had been grievously mutilated, but when its success at length came, it was decisive and unmistakable.

But a good deal of misapprehension prevails as to the actual position held by Aristotle in the literary criticism of the Italian Renaissance. The great impression made by his work was due in the first place to his manner of stating the question, which involved an altogether new conception of literary works as organic creations, and hence a new conception of the art of literary criticism. The one fatal fault of medieval literature had been the all-pervading absence (if one may use such an

* These Mr. Margoliouth describes as 'Saepe risum excussura, si ad locos Aristotelis quibus respondere debent comparentur.' 'Analecta Orientalia,' p. 39.

† 'Literary Criticism in the Renaissance,' by J. E. Spingarn, 1899.

‡ The first Latin translation, by Valla (1498), was so unsatisfactory as to be practically worthless.

expression) of the sense of artistic unity in regard to compositions of the longer kind. If any approach to it is attained, it is apparently by accident and unconsciously. The conception of unity of design on a large scale shows itself in the buildings of the Middle Ages, but doubtfully and fitfully in their literature. The Duomo of Florence and the cathedrals of Lincoln and Salisbury express an idea which is very generally wanting in the literature of the times to which they belong. Aristotle's law of unity dependent upon the attainment of a definite aesthetic result came, together with the great classical examples in Greek literature, as a veritable revelation, and in a certain very definite sense it may be said that from him arises almost all the inspiration and suggestion in the field of Renaissance criticism. But he is by no means accepted as an infallible guide. It was an age of almost unexampled intellectual activity, and freedom of speculation in this field was not confined by deference to the authority of a master, so much as tempered by the respect due to the intellectual superiority of a fellow-worker. To take a single example, Castelvetro is frequently referred to as if he were a servile follower of the rules of Aristotle. Those who speak of him thus can never have read his book. He was indeed so free in his criticism of the 'Poetics' that some of his contemporaries and followers found fault with him for what they regarded as his unnecessarily carping spirit. With regard to Scaliger again, even Mr. Spingarn speaks of him as entirely dependent upon the authority of Aristotle, as assuming that it is the duty of the poet first to find out what Aristotle says, and then to obey the precept without question.' This however is far from conveying a true impression of the spirit in which that great scholar worked. He is essentially independent, and hardly cites Aristotle at all in his own exposition of principles. In the preface indeed he speaks of Aristotle with rather scant respect: 'Aristotelis 'Commentarii mutili sunt, ne quid liberius excidat nobis,' and when he comes to criticise his system, he disputes his conclusions at almost every point. The theory that the essence of poetry is 'imitation' leads, he says, to the grossest absurdities, to classing as poetry the mimes of Sophron and the dialogues of Alexamenes, which were written in prose, and to refusing the title of poetry to such work as that of Empedocles or to a history such as that of Herodotus, if written in verse. In fact metre, according to Scaliger, is the differentia of poetry, an opinion which is very far removed from Aristotle. Again, he disputes Aristotle's position about action without character; finds fault with him for attributing to tragedy alone the effects which

are common to all poetry; insists upon poetical justice in tragedy, and formulates the principle of 'delightful teaching,' 'docere cum delectatione,' as the object of poetry, which was after his time widely enough accepted,* but which is certainly not Aristotelian. It is true that Scaliger speaks of Aristotle in one passage as 'imperator noster, omnium bonarum artium 'dictator perpetuus,' but the occasion of this reference is a question of physics, and not one of literary criticism at all. It is true also that Scaliger follows Aristotle much more closely at the beginning of his work than he does later, and seems at first practically to accept Aristotle's distinction between poetry and history. But it is evident throughout that he regards him not as an absolute authority, but as one whose judgement is to be accepted or rejected according to the dictates of reason.

This is true also of the earlier Italian critics, Minturno for example, and Fracastoro; and on one particular question a very lively controversy sprang up, in which the authority of Aristotle was to a great extent set aside. The Aristotelian principle of unity as applied to the epic could not by any means be so interpreted as to justify such a poem as the 'Orlando Furioso,' and yet it was felt that some place ought to be found for poetical work which was so generally pleasing. The leading part in this discussion was taken by Giraldi-Cintio, known to English readers chiefly as author of the 'Hecatommithi,' from which Shakespeare and others of his time borrowed plots for plays, but chiefly famous as a dramatist and a literary critic. Trissino had refused to call Boccaccio, Boiardo and Ariosto epic poets, because of the deficiency of their work in the matter of unity of design, and Cintio, who was a native of Ferrara and had been acquainted with Ariosto, took up the defence of the romances in his 'Discorsi,' published in 1554.† It is argued that the romance is a new form unknown to Aristotle, which has its own laws: though not accepted as a literary form by Greek and Latin writers, it has been developed with good success in Italian, and the good writers of it have given it as much authority as the Greek and Latin poets have given to the

* The origin of this is to be found in Horace: 'Aut prodesse volunt aut delectare poetae,' etc. Some of the earlier Italian critics, as Minturno, had practically adopted it.

† The first essay, 'Intorno al comporre dei Romanzi,' deals with this matter, and is addressed to Giovan Battista Pigna, who in the same year published a book on the same subject and accused Cintio, whose pupil he had been, of plagiarising his line of argument from a manuscript which had been entrusted to him for criticism.

epic. There are in fact two kinds of poems, those of single action and those of multiple action, and Aristotle's rules apply only to the former. If we choose this, we must follow the rules of it; but variety is charming, and the romances after all find some kind of a classical precedent in the 'Odyssey,' and more in the 'Metamorphoses.' The principle of 'decorum' in romances consists in observing in detail what is suitable to places, times and persons, and also in the style of expression which is used. Whatever may be the merit of the argument, it is a good example of reasonable respect for the opinions of Aristotle combined with freedom of judgement. Aristotle is always present as a source of suggestion, even where he is not mentioned; and Pigna, who equally with Cintio is engaged in vindicating the romances, says in effect, 'Though I have 'not mentioned Aristotle, and though he has not mentioned 'romances, yet his "Poetics" have been my guide throughout.'*

Castelvetro's extended Italian comment on the 'Poetics' was published at Vienna in 1570, and attained to a greater reputation than any other work of the kind.† As we have already noted, it has throughout a tone of critical independence, and the text of Aristotle furnishes the author with innumerable pegs on which to hang his own ideas. The discussions usually run to an inordinate length, and it is a serious undertaking to read the seven hundred and seventy pages conscientiously through; but the painstaking reader is rewarded by finding in them many matters of interest. Among these must be reckoned in particular the constant references to Italian literature in illustration of the subjects discussed. Boccaccio is the favourite author, and Aristotle's definition of the sphere of comedy leads up to the citation of a very long series of comic situations from the 'Decameron.' From the same source the author draws an abundant supply of examples of 'recognition' of various kinds, and the case of Boccaccio's Ghismonda is cited as an instance of inconsistency in female character, to match the unfeminine cleverness of Melanippe. But there are also many references to other writers. Pulci is found fault with for monstrous and improbable actions, Giraldi (Cintio) for impropriety in tragic prologues, Dante for inconsistency in his diverse representations of the character of Guido da Montefeltro, Petrarch for introducing pagan mythology into Christian poetry, and for seeming to cast doubt on the truth of his own

* I Romanzi, p. 65.

† 'Poetica d'Aristotele vulgarizzata e sposta,' per Lodovico Castelvetro.

poetical assumptions. Margaret of Navarre, 'nelle sue veraci 'novelle,' supplies an instance of a gentleman of Provence whose matrimonial arrangements involved complications far exceeding those of Oedipus; and Ariosto, in his account of the manner in which Orlando went mad, furnishes the critic with an admirable example of a catastrophe brought about by the means which were intended to avert it. Sanazzaro and Fracastoro are censured for improbability of incident, and Ariosto for unsuitable digression and other improprieties of various kinds; while sometimes the author will illustrate his text by anecdotes drawn from his own experience. We find also reference to other arts, and the parallel which Aristotle draws between poetry and painting gives Castelvetro an opportunity for introducing observations upon the practice and methods of Giotto, Michael Angelo and Pierino del Vago.

He is indeed essentially modern and practical throughout, and he solves the question about the romances not by making of them a new and separate class, but by denying that unity of the kind which Homer achieves is necessary to the epic poem, though it may be an additional attraction and is creditable to the ability of the poet. Even with regard to the drama he bases the law of unity not so much on the general principles of art as on the conditions of representation, and he may almost be said to deduce the unity of action from those of time and place. These he regards as necessary for proper stage effect and interprets them in the strictest manner. He assumes indeed that the time of the action must be the same as that of the representation, and estimates in his practical manner the number of hours that spectators can reasonably be expected to stay in the theatre at one sitting. It has been said that Castelvetro was the first inventor of the unity of place; but it is obvious that unity of time to a great extent implies unity of place, and the latter condition would doubtless have been accepted by Aristotle as a general rule, subject to a few exceptions, quite as readily as the former. Indeed such were the practical arrangements of the Greek theatre, that it might well have seemed to him superfluous to say that tragedy endeavoured to confine its action to one and the same place. Like most of the Italians, Castelvetro regards 'catharsis' as a process of purgation in the medical sense, but he does not rightly conceive of the manner in which it is supposed to work or of the pleasure which is incidental to it.

In the seventeenth century the most fruitful and scholarly criticism of the 'Poetics' is to be found in Holland. Daniel Heinsius in particular in his essay on 'Tragedy' expounds

the 'Poetics' on the whole with admirable insight, though he adopts from Castelvetro the erroneous idea that tragedy calms the emotions by inuring them to scenes which move pity and terror, as practice makes a surgeon indifferent to operations, or as a soldier is hardened by repeated experience of the horrors of war. Far more serious were the errors which attached to the criticism of Aristotle in France, arising partly from sheer misunderstanding, and partly from the nominal acceptance of the 'Poetics' as an authority from which there was no appeal, so that its meaning had to be forced into accordance with poetical practice. If we vow at all costs to be of the opinion of Aristotle, the result will probably be that Aristotle is compelled finally to be of our opinion.

The original sin of the French classical drama consisted not in the following of Castelvetro, as some affirm, but rather in the neglect of a truth which Castelvetro apprehended, namely, that tragedy is an appeal to the emotions rather than to the intellect, and in accepting accordingly the maxim 'docere 'cum delectatione' as an explanation of the object at which it aimed. The so-called unities of time and place were in a sense a legitimate deduction from Aristotle, though of course to speak of the 'three unities' as if they could conceivably be regarded as all standing on the same level, was a gross perversion of the spirit of the 'Poetics.' Again the rule that the principal persons in tragedy should be persons of exalted station is quite in accordance with the theory of Aristotle and the practice of Greek tragedy, and, it may be added, of Shakespeare also. The fundamental fault lay, not in these matters, but in the misconception, for which Scaliger was largely responsible, of the effect to be aimed at in tragedy. The explanation given by Corneille in his 'Discourse on Tragedy' very well exemplifies the nature of the error:

'La pitié d'un malheur où nous voyons tomber nos semblables nous porte à la crainte d'un pareil pour nous: cette crainte, au désir de l'éviter; et ce désir, à purger, modérer, rectifier, et même déraciner en nous la passion qui plonge à nos yeux dans ce malheur les personnes que nous plaignons, par cette raison commune, mais naturelle et indubitable, que pour éviter l'effet il faut retrancher la cause.' *

Setting aside the misunderstanding here of Aristotle's doctrine in almost every detail, we note as the main point that the effect of tragedy according to Corneille is a logical one; it

* Second Discours: 'Sur la tragédie.'

appeals to our reason: and this, while entirely opposed to the view taken in the 'Poetics,' is entirely in accordance with the spirit of French classical tragedy, which professing to rest upon the rules of Aristotle, is in fact, so far as fundamental principles are concerned, at a very great distance from him.

But in passing from Italian soil to French we have left the region of free criticism, in which sound reason and Aristotle are fairly weighed side by side; and we have entered a sphere in which it is assumed that the rules laid down or suggested by Aristotle are necessarily identical with the conclusions of reason. As Rapin says later, 'En effet sa Poétique n'est à 'proprement parler que la nature mise en méthode et le bon 'sens réduit en principes.' This being so, criticism is at an end, because the chief interest henceforth is not to understand what Aristotle meant, but to obtain from him something which will justify the practices to which authors are inclined. Corneille, when he wrote the passage which we have quoted, was concerned chiefly to show that the tragedies which he had written without regard to Aristotle were justifiable by the principles laid down in the 'Poetics,' and others were equally concerned in proving that their own ideas of the drama were those of Aristotle. We have no great interest then in following the fortunes of the 'Poetics' further in the literary criticism of Europe. The stage has been reached when comment on Aristotle takes the form of wresting his meaning to make it conform to certain foregone conclusions, just as texts of Scripture have been dealt with by theologians. Even Lessing is subject to the influence of this spirit: 'No 'less infallible than the Elements of Euclid' is written over a great part of his critical work; and though he understands Aristotle far better than the French, he is almost equally capable of obtaining from him on occasion whatever he may happen to require. Sound and scholarly criticism, apart from literary prepossessions, comes back only as the eighteenth century is drawing to a close, and in a country where the authority of Aristotle's rules had never been really powerful. Tyrwhitt and Twining look back naturally to the Italians, 'those learned, acute and indefatigable Italians,' as Twining calls them, and lead up naturally to the modern era of scholarship. This has given us not indeed a perfectly satisfactory text, but one which is incomparably superior to that with which the early interpreters had to struggle, and an apparatus of illustrative comment which enables us in reading the 'Poetics' to feel reasonably confident that we are in touch with the mind of the author.

Art. V.—PREHISTORIC MAN.

1. *Manuel d'Archéologie.* Par Joseph Déchelette. Paris: Librairie Alphonse Picard et Fils. 1908. 1910.
2. *Ancient Hunters and their Modern Representatives.* By W. J. Sollas, F.R.S. London: Macmillan and Co. 1911.
3. *Ancient Types of Man.* By Arthur Keith. London: Harper and Brothers. 1911.
4. *Anthropology.* By R. R. Marett. London: Williams and Norgate. 1911.
5. *Prehistoric Man.* By W. L. H. Duckworth. Cambridge: University Press. 1912.
6. *Aus dem Werdegang der Menschheit.* Von Dr. H. v. Buttel-Reepen. Jena: Gustav Fischer. 1911.
7. *Science from an Easy Chair.* By Sir Ray Lankester, K.C.B., F.R.S. London: Methuen and Co. 1910.
8. *The Mind of Primitive Man.* By Franz Boas. New York: The Macmillan Co. 1911.

It has sometimes been observed that an opposition exists between the methods of science and of history. It is certain that many of those who have been most successful in scientific research have been destitute of the historical sense, while on the other hand, historians have been apt to display but little interest in science. Of late the antithesis appears to be diminishing. We now talk of the 'science' of history. Sociologists have sprung up who treat history not as literature but as science. They regard the facts of history as material for generalisations: they endeavour to establish laws and principles, such as are sought for in natural science. History is no longer looked upon solely as an interesting or romantic story of the past.

While science encroaches upon history, history is beginning in another sense to encroach upon science. The history that is known best is that which is nearest to our own times. As we move backwards into the past, the records become fewer: the difficulty of reconstituting the past increases proportionally to its remoteness from us. Moreover those records preserve what are often not the most interesting features of the past. They tell us of the laws that were passed and the battles that were fought; they do not tell us the daily life of the people, how they lived, worked, dressed, or ate; what they looked

like and talked about. It is only with great difficulty that we can realise their social life; that we can in imagination walk among them and see and talk to them. We cannot bring the past to life again, in any but a very imperfect fashion.

Nevertheless history continues to expand: becoming fuller, and stretching farther back into the past. We walk over the flat expanses of East Anglia, and pick up a curiously worked piece of flint. It has been manufactured many thousand years ago by a human being, who was perceptibly more ape-like than ourselves. The explanation of that flint's existence has always been looked upon as belonging to the sphere of science. Yet so much is beginning to be known about these primitive men that there seems some scope for treating of them in the historical spirit, and endeavouring to reconstruct their lives and appearance. Certainly there are no written documents to guide us. The material at our disposal consists first of the implements which they made of bone, flint, or other hard stone; secondly, of a few skeletons or parts of skeletons of those ancient men which have from time to time been found; thirdly, of their drawings, and other artistic productions left in caves. The similarity of these remains to the products of various extant tribes of primitive people enable us to judge very roughly what they were like, and what kind of lives they used to lead.

Recent progress in the study of archaeology has been very rapid. The general recognition in latter years of the genuineness of cave-drawings and sculptures has added enormously to our interest in and knowledge of primitive man, while various finds of ancient skeletons have brought the whole subject thoroughly before the public attention. Accordingly there has been an outcrop of literature dealing with the subject. Professor Sollas has written a book giving a complete popular exposition of our present knowledge, combined with a good deal of speculation. Dr. Keith has published a smaller book containing the same account; adding somewhat speculative pictures of what he supposes certain ancient types of men may have looked like. The Home University Library has published a volume on anthropology by Mr. Marett, in a very vivacious and interesting style. To the Cambridge Manuals of Science and Literature has been added a volume on prehistoric man by Dr. Duckworth. Sir Ray Lankester's essays deal with the whole subject from a very attractive and human point of view. In Germany Dr. Buttel-Reepen has written one of several excellent popular handbooks recently published. From America comes Mr.

Boas's study of the mind of primitive man—a subject scarcely less interesting than his body. And finally there is M. Déchelette's monumental work: which contains the most complete abstract of the facts known up to the date of its publication.

Several of these works are written by the greatest living authorities on archaeology. They furnish us, among them, with the most complete information about primitive men that can be obtained. Yet no reader can avoid noticing how greatly the authors differ, the moment they abandon their narration of indisputable facts. In nothing is the difference so remarkable as in the various chronological estimates which are made in the endeavour to interpret geological epochs in terms of years. The facts available are so few as to afford a basis for only the vaguest of inferences. On the other hand, the immense interest of the subject constitutes a temptation to speculate, which has been carried far. And after all, this speculation is almost justifiable. There is no intrinsic interest in a skeleton found buried deep beneath the surface of the earth. The interest and importance of the find is in the clue which it affords to the race of beings who inhabited the Earth at remote ages in the past—their resemblance and difference from ourselves. We are therefore justified in drawing inferences, so long as we remember that they are only guesses. We are entitled to follow the train of thought raised by these geological heirlooms; remembering that the conclusions which we reach have very often nothing to recommend them save a slightly greater probability than any other conclusion suggested. It is in this spirit that we shall now approach the subject.

The most ancient human remains that have ever been found were discovered near a village called Trinil in the island of Java in 1891. Dr. Eugène Dubois, who had travelled to Jâva for the express purpose of finding the 'missing link,' first discovered in September of that year a molar tooth which excited his curiosity. Further operations brought to light a skull-cap of very remarkable appearance, lying near the tooth. In the following year, the thigh-bone of the left leg was discovered 50 feet off; and ultimately two other teeth were obtained. Examination of these remains has led to the most diverse views. Some have looked upon them as belonging to an ape which had close affinities with man; others as being actually a man with ape-like characteristics. It has been widely quoted as the 'missing link.'

One of the most significant contrasts between men and apes is in the size of the skull-cap, which encloses the brain;

among men, who are healthy, it varies from 900 cubic centimetres to 1900 cubic centimetres. Among apes it has never been known to exceed 600 cubic centimetres. Although the imperfect preservation of the Javanese skull makes it difficult to estimate its true volume, yet Dr. Dubois' latest measurements point to a cranial cavity of 850 cubic centimetres. On the strength of this measurement, the creature is held to be a true link between apes and men, and has received the name of Pithecanthropus, or Ape-Man. Yet it must be observed that, with regard to the size of skull, Pithecanthropus approaches more nearly to the lowest known man than to the highest known ape. If however, instead of taking extremes, we compare the skull of Pithecanthropus with the average skulls found among men and among apes, we find that it falls just about half-way between chimpanzees and Australians of a low type ; while it is considerably nearer to chimpanzees than to average Europeans. Moreover that part of the brain which bestows the power of speech is calculated to have been in Pithecanthropus just half-way between apes and men. So that whether we judge this ancient creature by its probable mental power, or as to its endowment of speech, it takes rank as a true link between human beings and anthropoid apes. From an examination of the thigh-bone, it is found that the animal walked erect, and it is judged that it was about the height of an ordinary Englishman. Yet in other respects it more closely resembled apes. Its forehead for instance was even more receding than that of the chimpanzee.

It is an interesting question as to when this strange animal may have lived, but the question does not admit of any definite answer. While some refer it to the Pliocene formations earlier than the glacial epoch, others place it at the commencement of the Pleistocene. How many hundred thousand years ago it may have existed is a speculation of the vaguest character. Much easier is it to decide what were the other animals associated with it. One of the most interesting species was an animal which appears to have combined the characters of the lion and the tiger. There were buffaloes, rhinoceroses, hippopotamuses, tapirs, pigs, elephants and various animals now extinct. Monkeys also have been found, and various birds and fishes, including a shark—suggesting the proximity of the sea. As to whether Pithecanthropus used implements is a question that cannot be decided ; none, at all events, have been found.

The only other remains of a similar primitive type that have been found were extracted from the Mauer sands a few miles

from Heidelberg in 1909 ; in this case the find was limited to a lower jaw only, but in an excellent state of preservation. Dentition however is found to furnish a very reliable feature for classification, and the discovery is of greater importance than might have been imagined at first. For the peculiarity of the Mauer jaw is that, whereas the teeth are completely human, the jaw itself might almost be mistaken for that of an ape. In its massiveness, absence of a chin, and other characters both general and special, it stands midway between man and the anthropoid apes.

There appears to be some reason for supposing that the Heidelberg man may have lived about the commencement of the quaternary epoch. In the Mauer sands have been found numerous remains of animals which show the character of the fauna at that time. There was an elephant, a rhinoceros, bears, lions, a dog, a boar, deer, bison, beaver and horse. These remains give rise to the opinion that the climate was warm ; and that one of the genial episodes of the Great Ice Age was in progress.

These two finds of semi-human remains constitute all that can be assigned as a missing link. It is true that many of the other human fossils, about to be mentioned, present unmistakeably simian characteristics. But there can be no sort of doubt that they were what we should call human beings, or that they are comparable with the most primitive of existing savage races. Neither Pithecanthropus nor the Heidelberg jaw is comparable with existing races ; they appear to belong to species altogether distinct, although it is now believed that the Heidelberg jaw may have belonged to the Neanderthal race.

Since the earliest remains of primitive man cannot be assigned to an epoch earlier than the Great Ice Age, it has been assumed that he cannot have existed before that time. But the assumption is without force. So complete is the disintegration of human skeletons that it is only by an excessively rare accident that these very primitive examples should have been preserved ; and, having been preserved, should be discovered.

A human skeleton is unfortunately highly perishable ; and a preservation of the bones of ' primitive man ' only occurs as an exceedingly rare chance. The most favourable site for such preservation is in caves, whose floors after a time become covered in with stalagmite ; but when man himself was in the habit of dwelling in caves, he obviously would not suffer corpses to remain there. He strewed about in his caves the bones of the animals which he used for food ; but when

one of his own kind died, he took him out and buried him in the open. Bones exposed to the action of water are soon dissolved; and unless they should happen to be embedded in clay or some hard deposit, which is raised up free from the action of water before dissolution is complete, they will altogether disappear. Occasionally however burial took place in caves; doubtless the corpse must have been an important person, to justify the sacrifice of so valuable a natural home. Occasionally also the roof of a cave would fall in, killing and burying its human occupants.

Thus, although the Neanderthal race at one time inhabited Europe, only about a dozen specimens have been secured. Farther back still, the chance of discovering a fossil man must be still more remote. Few suppose that Pithecanthropus was a solitary individual; it has indeed been suggested that he was a microcephalic idiot, or a monster born from human and simian parents. But the rational view is that he was one of a race of ape-men, of antiquity so extreme that no other specimen has yet been found. And if the excessive rarity of early Pleistocene man is borne in mind, it can scarcely be a matter for surprise that no specimens at all of still earlier man should yet have been discovered.

Nevertheless the question as to whether there were earlier men is still hotly debated. The question may perhaps be to some extent a question of words and names. It is a necessary corollary from the evolution theory that man has developed from some lower form of animal. There must therefore have existed, prior to the Great Ice Age, some semi-human creature from which man was descended. Whether we call this creature man seems to be a matter of no particular importance; the discovery of still earlier remains would indicate only what precise stage of developement our ancestors had attained in the epoch of the strata in which they were discovered.

There exists however another criterion of the existence of man, and that is the capacity to fashion stone implements. The implements of Palaeolithic or early Stone Age, being mainly made of flint, naturally are not subject to the disintegration which overtakes bones. They survive unchanged, and indicate the degree of civilisation attained by their manufacturers. As we descend into the past, we find these implements becoming ever more primitive. From the iron or steel age in which we now live, we pass to the copper age, to the bronze age, and to the stone age. The age of stone implements is itself divided into two—the more recent neolithic, when the implements were often polished—and the more ancient palaeolithic in which

they were rough. Earlier than the palaeolithic implements, again, are the so-called eoliths; curiously shaped flints in which it is altogether doubtful whether they are artefact or of natural origin. Upon the conclusion which is reached with regard to these depends our estimate of the antiquity of man.

Professor Sollas adopts an attitude of extreme scepticism with regard to the alleged artefact origin of eoliths. He shows that they might possibly be produced by natural methods such as variations of temperature, rushes of water, or by the movement of strata while settling under pressure of the soil, as believed by the Abbé Breuil. And it may be at once admitted that by natural processes of this character, flints may become flaked in such a manner as to suggest human workmanship. But the proof that they may be so produced is not a proof that they all are produced in this way. It appears to us that to deny human workmanship in all cases where it is not wholly unmistakeable is to carry scepticism too far. Is it to be supposed that the earliest men who ever chipped a flint would at once succeed in modelling it into an obviously artificial instrument? Doubtless men first made use of the natural pebbles which they found lying about. After some time, they would discover that stones with sharp points were more effective for certain purposes than blunt stones. But stones with sharp points are not always to be had in the quantity desired; an inventive genius therefore hit on the plan of knocking off flakes to form a point. His endeavour would probably be to imitate natural stones, which were insufficiently numerous, rather than to create at once a novel implement. How would these imitations be distinguished from the stones which have been accidentally chipped in nature? And are we to suppose that the workmanship will at once develope into flights that are unquestionably artificial? Professor Sollas himself repudiates the idea.

While therefore we are quite ready to admit that Nature may make flints which resemble the handiwork of man, yet it seems to be no less true that man must have begun by making flints which resemble the handiwork of Nature. We shall expect therefore to find that, as we travel into the remoter past, the artefact origin of chipped flints will become always less conspicuous, until finally it is altogether lost. But we shall not therefore conclude that 'eoliths' are necessarily of natural origin. We shall suspect that many of them are artefact, though that suspicion will not be adequate to furnish us with evidence, of any reliability, of the existence of man.

A more tangible ground for disputing Professor Sollas's estimate of the antiquity of man has been afforded since the publication of his book. Mr. J. Reid Moir, of Ipswich, has discovered a series of flint implements, of obviously human manufacture, in the detritus beds at the base of the Red Crag in Suffolk. These implements are of a novel type, to which Sir Ray Lankester has applied the name of rostro-carinate. The geological position of the strata in which they lay indicates the existence of a race of men living at the close of the Pliocene epoch; and makes it probable that human beings must have existed before the onset of the Great Ice Age.

At the outset of the Palaeolithic era, when the Heidelberg man is supposed to have lived, the face of Europe was very different from what it is at present. Great Britain was united to the mainland both along its eastern and its southern boundaries. Where the German Ocean now is was a wide valley down which flowed the waters of the Rhine, swelled by its tributary the Thames, and reaching the sea not far from the Faroe Islands. Where the English Channel now is was similarly the valley through which the Seine reached its destination in the Atlantic Ocean. The Mediterranean was traversed by an isthmus connecting Africa through Sicily with Europe. Possibly Europe was still connected with Greenland through Iceland and the Faroes. The Great Ice Age had completed its first episode: the ice which had covered the greater part of Europe had now receded for a time and left a fine warm climate. In England elephants and rhinoceroses wandered at large. Hippopotamuses disported themselves in the waters of the Thames. Bison, wild horses, deer, and the sabre-toothed tiger were all common. Man had advanced in the arts so far as to sharpen stones for purposes of cutting. And for a very long time these sharpened stones are the only traces that we find of him. The first unquestionable implements are simply stones with edges for use as knives or scrapers: no weapons are found among them. Gradually the character of the workmanship improves, and a constancy of form comes to be acquired.

While these advances were being made, the climate was again becoming colder, as the ice advanced over Europe once more. Animals proper to warm climates were now mingled with animals proper to cold climates. Elephants from the south were interspersed with mammoths, whose long hair and fur and layers of fat fitted them to withstand the rigours of a glacial epoch. The woolly rhinoceros also made his

appearance equally well provided by nature against the cold. Primitive man, who had hitherto enjoyed a southern climate, now began to find life harder. It is suggested that about this time he contracted the habit of living in caves. The ice continued to creep slowly over the surface of Great Britain, and several thousand years had to elapse before it receded once again and gave way to a genial climate once more.

It is not till these profound changes had occurred that we find, in addition to the stone implements, remains of the skeletons of man himself. The implements meanwhile have very much improved. They no longer consist of heavy stones with sharpened edges; flakes are now split off from stones, and wrought with far greater precision into serviceable tools. The hippopotamus and other denizens of a warm country have disappeared; and the mammoth and rhinoceros are abundant. Among other animals were the bison, reindeer, musk ox, the glutton, arctic fox, and lemming. But most interesting of all was man himself, of whom many relics have been found that now have to be described. We have reached Middle Palaeolithic times, and the race of men then existing are known by the name of Mousterians. According to Professor Sollas, the Mousterians were the earliest men to live in caves: it is in caves at all events that his remains are found.

The first discovery of Mousterian man to excite interest was made in 1856 near Düsseldorf. Some workmen were quarrying limestone in a cave, when they found what is now known as the Neanderthal skeleton. They were not aware of its importance, and great injury was inflicted upon it before portions of it fell into the hands of Dr. Fuhlrott. Among these was the skull-cap; and an inspection of this led Huxley to declare that, although certainly human, it was more ape-like than any other skull he had ever seen. Since that time other remains have been found in various parts of Europe, which have been recognised to belong to the same race or a similar race with the Neanderthal man. At Spy in Belgium two nearly complete skeletons were found in 1885; several lower jaws have been obtained from different places; from Krapina, in Croatia, fragments of about a dozen individuals have been collected; in 1909 skeletons were found in the cave of La Chapelle-aux-Saints in the department of the Corrèze and at Le Moustier in Dordogne, the latter giving the name to the whole race; others have been discovered still more recently. With the aid of these numerous examples it has became possible to form a tolerably accurate idea of the bony

characteristics of Mousterian man. Not long ago an attempt was made at the laboratory of Professor Marcelin Boule in Paris to reconstruct a Mousterian upon a cast of the skeleton of the specimen from Chapelle-aux-Saints. But the restoration, while still incomplete, was unfortunately destroyed by the floods in Paris a year ago. In general appearance the Mousterian appears to have had a very large nose, with an extremely long upper lip. Over the eyes extended a prominent ridge, and the forehead was receding. The jaws were large and heavy, especially the lower jaw, which was further remarkable for the absence of a chin. The wisdom teeth, instead of being, as among existing men, the smallest of the molars, were the largest.

The caves inhabited by Mousterian men furnish a large supply of the bones of other animals on which these men used to feed. The cave-bear was eaten, especially young ones; the wild horse and reindeer, the mammoth, rhinoceros, and bison also furnished food; in one cave near Palermo the cave-men had left relics indicating a slaughter of at least 2000 hippopotamuses. There is evidence that cannibalism was also practised, for at Krapina have been found numerous charred human bones. In many of these caves the hearths are found just as they were left by the inhabitants: the embers of extinct fires are quite untouched, and the broken bones of the animals used for food lie about with the stone implements of the Mousterians.

So great is the resemblance in many respects between the Mousterians and the modern Australian aborigines that Professor Sollas feels justified in making the suggestion that the latter are in fact descended from the former. If the Mousterians were strong and prosperous, they would overflow their European home. Their inferior tribes would be driven outwards, and since there was then a land connexion between Europe and Australia, they would finally take root in that distant country. Other and stronger races were ultimately to drive out the Mousterians from Europe: it may therefore be that they have survived in a remote and unattractive country, where they were relieved from the pressure of stronger peoples. That, however, is pure speculation. All that is known for certain is that Europe was inhabited by a race not very dissimilar from the Australian aborigines, at a time certainly not less than a hundred thousand years ago, possibly very much more remote.

From the Mousterian or Middle Palaeolithic Age we pass to the Upper Palaeolithic, and at once great changes are observed. At its opening the climate appears to have been warm and

sunny. Europe was profiting from one of those genial intervals which are supposed to have divided the Great Ice Age. The cold fauna are sparsely represented: the reindeer is rare; horses, cave-lions and hyenas are abundant. But this agreeable interlude soon altered. For the last time, the ice was advancing slowly over the continent of Europe, bringing with it the fauna of arctic countries. The climate steadily deteriorated and the men of Upper Palaeolithic times must have had a hard struggle against the cold. Although cold, the climate was also dry at this period, like the steppes of Russia. The reindeer also became exceedingly common, and gives a distinctive character to that age.

The implements of the Upper Palaeolithic men show an improvement on those of the Mousterians. They were no longer made only of stone; bone and ivory were also used. It is possible that progress was greatly facilitated by the genial climate: man no longer had the whole of his energies employed in obtaining food; and we now for the first time discover new traces of his activities in the drawings and sculpturings which he executed on the walls and ceilings of his caves. Although the first discovery of a painted cave was made in 1878, yet the event was so extraordinary that few at first could be found to believe in its genuineness. It was not till the opening of the present century that repeated discoveries of a similar nature produced universal conviction. For not only were further paintings discovered, but the instruments used by the painters were also brought to light: the red oxide of iron which served for pigment, and the pestles in which it was pounded up. The physical surroundings of the paintings, such as thick layers of stalactite covering them, prove further their extreme antiquity.

The subjects of these paintings are mainly animals, and to a great extent animals that have now become extinct. Mammoths, for instance, are depicted with lifelike reality. We know exactly what a mammoth looked like, from the frozen specimen which was found in 1901 in excellent preservation in the ice of Siberia—now stuffed in the St. Petersburg Museum. Bison were common subjects for the Palaeolithic artists: reindeer, horses, antelopes are common. Natural events are also depicted—a wounded bison, and incidents of the chase. The art was exceedingly fine, when we remember that, painting in a cave, the artist had not his models before him, and had often to assume awkward attitudes in reaching the various parts of his 'canvas.' At Niaux in the Pyrenees, trout are represented in admirable likeness to the fish still existing there.

In this cave also, which runs for nearly a mile into the mountains, was found the imprint of a man's foot. So deathlike is the stillness in these deep caverns that for many thousand years this footprint had been preserved in the loose sand, where a single draught of air might have obliterated it. So close a confrontation with Palaeolithic man has upon us the same kind of effect that Robinson Crusoe experienced on a similar occasion.

Another cave in the Pyrenees is of peculiar interest owing to the very numerous impressions of human hands with which its walls are covered. It is found moreover that many of them appear to have been mutilated, since they lack one or more fingers. It is possible that this indicates a custom of mutilation among this artistic race, such as prevails among the Australians, Bushmen and many other primitive peoples. It is possible, on the other hand, that the fingers were not amputated at all but simply turned down—perhaps as a sign, but more probably possessing no significance whatever.

The most interesting question is as to who this artistic race might be. It certainly was not the Mousterians. Although many believe that the Mousterians became modified into the existing white races, yet it seems more probable that they became extinct or were overrun by more powerful races which had developed elsewhere. In the Grotte des Enfants near Mentone there have actually been discovered two skeletons which are believed to belong to the race of artists, and an examination of them reveals that they were of negroid type of low stature and closely resembling the modern South African Bushmen. Professor Sollas goes farther: he thinks there is ground for the suspicion that the Bushmen are descended from this ancient negroid race, just as the Australians may be descended from the Mousterians. Not only is there anatomical resemblance between the two, but the Bushmen also are a race of artists, and their paintings have a conspicuous family likeness to those of the Palaeolithic Europeans. It was already held on quite independent evidence that the Bushmen had migrated southwards through Africa. There appears therefore to be really considerable evidence to connect them with the negroid race which inhabited the Mediterranean area many tens of thousands of years ago.

But they were not the only artistic race of Upper Palaeolithic times; an entirely different people, known as the Cromagnards, were also in existence. By comparison of a number of skeletons it is known that these were of tall stature with a cranial capacity even larger than that of modern Europeans. Where they came

from, or whither they went, no one knows. That they were a highly gifted race which inhabited a great part of Europe in Upper Palaeolithic times is all that is known of them. But there is evidence to show that yet another race closely resembling the Eskimos also lived in Europe with the Cromagnards. Where they came from is equally unknown. Whither they went may, however, be some day ascertained: Professor Sollas thinks that they were no other than the ancestors of existing Eskimos. He holds that there is 'no reasonable 'doubt' that a veritable Eskimo lived in the south of France (where his skeleton was found) in Palaeolithic times. He throws out the suggestion that there may be a corresponding connexion between the Cromagnards and the American Indians.

It is highly probable that these latest representatives of Palaeolithic times were driven out by the Neolithic people, as they themselves had driven out their predecessors. If this hypothesis is correct, they may have found their way to the New World over Behring Strait and the Aleutian Islands. Thus each successive inroad of a superior race into Europe caused the older race to migrate to more remote and less attractive countries—to Australia, to South Africa, to the frozen margin of North America.

The Neolithic men themselves had none of the art which characterised the Cromagnards. They were a people of material progress: the industrial arts, and not the fine arts, occupied their attention. They were not, like the Palaeolithic men, purely hunters who lived in caves. They tilled the land, they kept herds, they built wooden houses, sometimes on piles in the water, like the Glastonbury lake-dwellers. Their implements also, although still made either of flint or greenstone, were often polished and showed a very high standard of workmanship.

It may, in fact, often be noticed in history that the artistic temperament precedes and is ousted by the scientific. The great age of Greek art was succeeded by the age of Alexandrian science. The Elizabethan age produced a literature and poetry which we with our science and commercial prosperity cannot now rival. The 'grand siècle' or classical age of French literature was succeeded by the scientific and materialist propaganda of the eighteenth century. In just the same manner the material prosperity of Neolithic times succeeded the artistic races of Palaeolithic hunters.

This profound change took place in Western Europe not less than 7000 years ago. The rigours of the Great Ice Age were finally passed: the climate was mild: the wild animals

were those we now have, but far more abundant than at present. Europe presented a rich moist pasture-land with abundant peat-bogs and woodlands.

At about 2000 B.C. took place the discovery of metals, which has been fraught with such immense consequences for mankind. About this time, when the big stones of Stonehenge were being set in position, the Bronze Age replaced the Stone Age. The ancient Britons were still in the Bronze Age at the time of the Roman conquest. The Romans themselves had already passed from it to the Iron Age some centuries previously.

A notable fact about the succession of these primitive races is that each one appears to have represented a certain phase of civilisation and then to have become extinct or sunk into obscurity. The Mousterians whom we find braving the glacial era with the help of their primitive flint implements were an altogether different race from the more highly endowed race of artists who succeeded them. These again were destined to vanish before the inroads of the Neolithic men; and once again, these disappeared before the progress of historical races. We do not see any race advancing continuously from one stage to another. Humanity as a whole has advanced by a succession of different races, the new one with its higher endowments displacing or extinguishing the old. No single race has represented more than one step in human evolution.

Now it is an important question whether the conquering races owe their success to superior qualities in themselves or to some other chance factor. Everyone who has not studied the question must at once assume that the conquering race is the superior. Professor Bergson in his 'Evolution Créatrice' lays down the proposition that success is the criterion of superiority; it is one of those apparently obvious deductions that everyone assents to, until it is questioned. Yet deduction in biological and anthropological regions has generally proved so utterly unreliable that there has long been a general tendency to discard the method altogether, and believe in nothing but the plain results of observation and experience. As Darwin said, Nature will deceive us if she possibly can. The most ingenious traps appear to be laid for leading astray anyone who begins to reason. And the deduction that the successful races are the superior races is just one of these *à priori* assertions that become the more doubtful the more we study the evidence.

What are we to understand by superiority? There can be no question that mental superiority is related in a general way to the size of the brain. We shall recur shortly to the evidence for this statement; but assuming it for a moment

to be true, we are confronted with the fact that the Mousterians, who are the earliest undoubted human beings ever discovered, had brains not smaller on the average than those of modern Europeans, while the giant race of Cromagnards, famous for their art, actually excelled modern Europeans in the volumes of their brain-cavities; in short, that if mental superiority is to be associated with size of brain, we must rank ourselves as inferior to those primitive men, still in the Stone Age, who gained their precarious livelihood by hunting, and scratching up the roots of wild plants.

At first sight, this seems an awkward fact for the theory of organic evolution; and there are not wanting those who hastily explain it away by denying connexion between mental superiority and size of brain. Even Professor Sollas, whose high authority cannot be questioned, endeavours to belittle the significance of large brains. He presents a list of distinguished men whose brains have been weighed after their death, in order to show that there is little connexion between genius and size of brain. Leibnitz, for instance, is quoted as an example of a man with a small brain who attained 'the highest 'flights of genius.' This is all very well, but it appears to us to go too far. The fact cannot be denied that quality of brain is of no less importance than quantity. A small brain of fine quality will far surpass a larger brain of poor quality. Mr. Boas in his admirable work on 'The Mind of Primitive Man' gives special attention to this point. He quotes Manouvrier's measurement of the skull-capacities of 35 eminent men, resulting in an average of 1665 cubic centimetres, as against 1560 cubic centimetres in 110 ordinary individuals. Galton similarly found that the heads of the best students were larger on the average than the heads of ordinary students. And again, the brains of eminent men, when weighed, are found to be heavier than the brains of ordinary men. In a wider sphere also, it has to be noted that the greatest difference between men and beasts is on the one hand in the mental superiority of the former; on the other hand, in the far greater size of their brains. On the whole, those races which are the most advanced are those which have the largest brains; those, like the Australians, which are most primitive, have the smallest; idiots have smaller brains than are found among normal people. We do not think, therefore, that it is possible to evade the conclusion that the large brains of Mousterian men indicate very remarkable mental qualities.

And why should we want to evade that conclusion? Doubtless we look round at the wonderful progress of our own civilisa-

tion; we then look at the simple stone implements which represent the civilisation of the Mousterian cave-dwellers; and we cannot conceive that this savage should have an intellect comparable with our own. Yet let us not go too fast. We do not owe our civilisation to the size of our individual brains, or to any individual mental prowess; we owe it to the accumulated discoveries and advances of our ancestors for innumerable generations back. Most of us pass approximately the first twenty years of our lives in merely mastering the acquisitions of our predecessors. And where we have no 'education' to fall back upon, our intelligence is by no means so conspicuous. Many people hold, for instance, that, but for cumulated experience, we have no better minds than the ancient Greeks; for their philosophy was not much inferior to ours, and their art is still unrivalled. The whole of our civilisation is really due to the cumulated knowledge of innumerable centuries, which is passed on as an external inheritance from generation to generation.

Supposing any of us were turned out from babyhood into the world, without any sort of education or any fraction of external inheritance, should we be so very much superior to Palaeolithic man? Should we have discovered the art of sharpening stones as weapons, should we be able to slay great beasts like the elephant and hippopotamus, to convey ideas by means of language, to light fires and protect ourselves from the miserable inclemencies of the Great Ice Age? Should we be able to do all these things by our own originality, with no education or example even remotely suggested to us? It is doubtful. Yet all these things were done by Palaeolithic man. He had taken the most transcendent steps upwards; he had immeasurably passed the brute creation; he was already master of his world. We remember the proverb: 'Il n'y a 'que le premier pas qui coûte.' To take that first step, without precedent or education, may very well have demanded a mental capacity of the highest order. Accordingly, there appears to be no sort of reason for astonishment in the fact that the brains of the earliest men who used implements should be found no smaller than the brains of modern Europeans. They reached a civilisation tens of thousands of years ago that was not far behind the present civilisation of the Australians. Far from joining Professor Sollas in his attempt to explain away the significance of the large brains of Mousterian men, we cannot resist the belief that those large brains afford us real assistance in the attempt to understand the great strides they had made in civilisation.

Mr. Boas goes with some care into the origin of the various human types. Like everyone else who has studied the subject, he finds that heredity is a far more important factor than environment. Men are first what their heredity has made them, and secondly what their environment has made them. Yet he will not deny to the environment the power to modify permanently the structure of a race, and quotes in evidence some interesting observations of his own. He investigated the structural changes that were to be observed in the children of immigrants into the United States from various different peoples, and found that they all began to converge towards a common American type, losing their national distinctiveness. The heads of Sicilian people are elongated, while the heads of their American-born children are rounder. The Central European, on the contrary, whose head is naturally short, has children in America whose heads are longer in proportion to their width. From such facts as these Mr. Boas infers that environment has a pronounced and permanent effect on physical structure.

The experiments are certainly suggestive, but there are so many possible causes of error that they can scarcely be taken as conclusive. The shape of the head, for instance, may depend upon the mechanical effects resulting from the different positions in which babies are put to sleep in different countries. It seems to be true that a child kept constantly on its back tends to become flattened and short-headed, while one lying on its side becomes long-headed. There is, moreover, the possibility, or rather the certainty, of some infusion of American blood. Among very large numbers of immigrants the probability can scarcely be denied that some of the children who are born owe their existence, not to their reputed fathers, but to American fathers ; and even a slight admixture of this kind would affect the statistics. There is again the effect of different feeding and of different modes of life to be considered. We know that all parts of the body are correlated in a very close, almost mysterious, manner. An affection of some particular part will produce changes in another very remote part that are altogether incomprehensible. There is, then, nothing unintelligible in the belief that head-shape may be correlated with some other part, affected by altered modes of life. Nevertheless Mr. Boas's experiments do leave an impression upon the mind that structure may be in some way dependent upon environment ; though how it is so is quite unexplained. In the present case, natural selection cannot be invoked ; for the time in which the alterations were observed was insufficient for its operation.

None the less, natural selection must have been a potent force in the evolution of the ancient races of men; and climate must have been largely instrumental in that selection. The civilisation of historical times began in warm climates; Egypt is the oldest and warmest known. Thence it spread North to Greece, Italy, and South Europe; and its general tendency is now towards still more northerly countries. A hot country like India, on the other hand, has never been able to breed for long a powerful and conquering race. The history of India has been a history of inroads of people from colder climates, who have overrun the country, to become themselves conquered in course of time by fresh invaders. The present arrangement, under which the country is governed by a race, constantly renewed from a cold climate, is possibly the only chance of a permanent stability for that country.

With regard to heredity of races, the really great question is whether the hereditary elements are mingled in crossing, or whether they tend to separate out again, as maintained by the Mendelians. Galton's law was that on the average, in children, half the inheritance was due to the parents, one-quarter to the grandparents, one-sixteenth to the great-grandparents, and so on. The modifications required in the law are probably only slight.

We now come to the important topic of the mental characteristics of primitive man, on which Mr. Franz Boas has written so truly valuable a treatise. The main innovation of his doctrine is that the key to the peculiarities of the primitive mind is to be sought in its emotional side, not in its intellectual side. We had ourselves already set forth that doctrine in an article on Descriptive Sociology in April 1911, and it is gratifying to find so powerful an adherent as Mr. Boas. We shall now proceed to examine in some detail the differences between the primitive and the civilised mind. Mr. Boas must not be held responsible for the views stated, unless his name is specially involved.

Beginning with the most important, we believe that difference in the power of attention and concentration is fundamental. Primitive man cannot concentrate his attention for long on any one thing, nor can he grasp simultaneously more than one or two simple facts. That is to say, his power of attention is limited both as to duration and as to breadth. Among civilised peoples, versatility is one of the most constant signs of ability. A capable mind has an immensely greater number of interests than a feeble mind. Attention wanders over a very wide field, and can travel from one subject to another

very remote, with little difficulty, while in a lowly-endowed mind it is confined within narrow limits. Doubtless many instances can be recalled in which distinguished men have very narrow interests, famous professors who know nothing outside their special subject. But we have already uttered a warning against the Bergsonian confusion of success with ability. These instances must be regarded as people whose ability is only ordinary, but in whom the total suppression of outside interests produces an almost unnatural power in the one subject where interest is retained. At certain types of elementary, but highly monotonous work, idiots are found to be more efficient than properly developed persons. But we do not assume that the idiots have greater mental endowments in consequence. If we dam up a river, leaving only a narrow opening, the waters will rush through that opening with irresistible force.

Great mental superiority, especially if it is left natural and free, will be accompanied by great versatility—a versatility, indeed, which may heavily militate against success. For when the mental stream flows along a very wide course, its vitality and power must be enormous in order to equal the force of another stream with far less water but narrower banks. The most successful propagandism is often the blindest and most bigoted. The most successful individuals are often those who approximate to mono-ideism. The present suffragette movement is a case in point. Its frenzy is due to mono-ideism, the total absorption of the mind upon one idea, which is therefore worked out with an energy and fury utterly disproportionate to any beneficial results that could possibly be attained by it. The obsession relentlessly drives previously respectable persons into criminal and despicable actions: its immense propagandist power is not to be connected with any mental superiority, but with a pathological limitation of the mental interests: and the frenzy can only be cured by endeavouring to relieve the mental contracture and to enlarge the interests.

The capacity to do several things at a time is therefore characteristic of a superior mind. If we are walking with a peasant in the country and introduce some subject of conversation in which he is interested he immediately stops walking. Now walking, though consuming no conscious attention, occupies the mind to some extent sub-consciously: it is a slight distraction. Yet, although slight, the peasant cannot combine it with other calls on the attention. He can attend to one thing only at a time: he can talk, or he can walk; but

his mind is of insufficient breadth to do both at the same time. So it is the case, that with all people a long walk is far more fatiguing when it has been accompanied by animated conversation.

The great variety of interests of superior minds is further exemplified by a hatred of monotony. Many primitive peoples do not seem to know the meaning of monotony: they will produce single works of art, which have cost years of unvarying labour to the producer. Mr. Boas quotes a number of facts such as these, to show that the primitive mind is capable of prolonged attention to matters in hand. But we are unable to agree with him. The attention is not consciously invoked and sustained by dint of mental superiority. It is merely an expression of that semi-idiotic feebleness that remains in the groove once marked out. It does not remain within the limits from an intelligent determination to do so, but from lack of mental elasticity, which might suggest a change of occupation—a complete suppression of outside interests, and an inert pursuit of any occupation once initiated. Mr. Boas is remarkedly apt to mistake mono-ideism for mental superiority, which, as already remarked, would entitle idiots to a high mental position. Primitive man then is characterised in the first place by an incapacity for sustained attention, or for attention to more than a very narrow class of objects at a time. He was very probably liable to domination by fixed ideas which might even transcend the powers of healthy attention; but this condition was not, strictly speaking, healthy: it was not physiological, but pathological.

Mr. Boas's most valuable contribution is on the subject of the emotional traits of primitive men. If his book has one aim more than another, that aim is to establish the mental equality of the white and other coloured races. Writing in the United States, where the colour question is so important, it is far more difficult to take an unbiassed view than in this country. The author's desire to advance the cause of the blacks has our unqualified sympathy; but we believe he has gone much too far in his effort to reduce the mental distinction between the two. In versatility of attention—a trait which deeply affects the whole mind—the coloured races cannot be compared with the white. Mr. Boas has attached far too little importance to mental heredity, and too much to environment, powerfully operative though this may often be.

His attempt to establish an intellectual equality leads him to affiliate intellectual activity upon emotion; and it is here

that the main achievement of his book lies. He quotes Lehmann as follows :

> 'The character of a system of philosophy is, just like that of any other literary work, determined first of all by the personality of its originator. Every true philosophy reflects the life of the philosopher, as well as every true poem that of the poet. Secondly, it bears the general marks of the period to which it belongs ; and the more powerful the ideas which it proclaims, the more strongly it will be permeated by the currents of thought which fluctuate in the life of the period. Thirdly, it is influenced by the particular bent of philosophical thought of the period.'

These observations are profoundly true, not only of philosophical thought but of all thought. It is a product firstly of the man, secondly of the times. No man can think much outside the limits of his age ; in a civilised age those limits will be wide, in a primitive age they will be narrow. The total amount of originality, or of novel ideas, is singularly few. Most of modern literature of the serious kind is gathered round a few central ideas which change but slowly, and those ideas are reiterated endlessly in the large majority of books, magazines and newspapers. The form of expression and the details are altered, but the ideas are always the same. We thus have an explanation of the often noted fact that small readers often seem to know much more than large. For the large reader is only going over the same ground time after time : the small reader with a few well-chosen books, or sometimes even with magazines, will master all the solid material that is afloat, and will have far more time and energy to digest it. For something new, he then has to travel either to foreign literature or to literature of another period.

All this is simply saying that there is a general 'spirit of 'the age' that we cannot go against. Now different ages have different spirits : we have already noted the frequency with which an artistic spirit gives place to a scientific. Our own age is a scientific age : the associations with which we bind things together are those suggested by reason. In an artistic age, the main associations will be those suggested by æsthetic sentiments. If we compare Shakespeare with Newton, we should find it difficult to say which was the more intellectual of the two. Each formed wide associations between distant ideas, but the character or purpose of the associations differed altogether. In one case the association was formed under the influence of æsthetic perception, in the other under the influence of reason.

So, among primitive peoples, it is a mistake to argue intellectual

inferiority from the fact that the things they associate are widely different from the things we associate. Their predominant sentiment was not reason, nor was it art. It may have been mythological or patriotic or what not. An intense obsession by some mythological sentiment might lead to the association of things which we never think of bracketing together: and that associative bond might imply a high intellectual effort. Let us take an instance.

It appears to us a strange association of ideas that the proper way of curing a deadly disease is to administer a violent thrashing to the patient. If our associations are guided by reason, we may even fail altogether to understand the meaning of it. But if they are governed by mythology, believing in universal presence of spirits and demons, we shall think naturally enough that a disease is an evil spirit, which may be driven off by producing discomfort in the body it has selected for a residence. Sucking at the body appears equally intelligent. From the intellectual standpoint these 'discoveries' may be entirely on a par with many of our own that are thoroughly reasonable. They indicate not inferior intelligence, but a different emotional trend: a different criterion of association.

We are much too apt to assume that our own scientific 'spirit' is the only possible way of looking at things. It appears to us plain that the way to find out something is to look and see, supposing the object is available. Elementary logic appears to us a necessary component of intellect. But the history of philosophy shows that, on the contrary, logic of the most elementary kind has been absent from thinkers of the highest intelligence. The greatest discovery ever made in philosophy was that the way to discover whether a thing is present is to look and see. It was proclaimed by Aristotle in the ancient world, and by Francis Bacon in the modern world. Yet obvious as it appears to us, it was altogether disbelieved by so wonderful a genius as Plato. He held that this was quite an erroneous method of working: and he upheld as true whatever coincided with his sentiments of beauty or propriety. To ascertain a fact by observation appeared to him irrational. Yet we must unquestionably look upon Plato as possessing an intellect of the highest order.

Now this prevailing 'spirit' which causes us to look at things from altogether different points of view is, as Mr. Boas rightly affirms, an emotional, not an intellectual feature. The great majority of instances produced to show intellectual inferiority in primitive races prove only emotional difference. It is only in anthropologically recent times that certain races

of men have been dominated by the logical emotions: the material success which follows, enables that race to flourish and spread at the expense of others not necessarily inferior, but animated by an aesthetic or mythological spirit. Thus it was perhaps that the magnificent race of large-brained Cromagnards passed away before the Neolithic invasion.

Mr. Boas points out the different classifications of colours that prevail among primitive people. We assume for instance that green, blue, and yellow are natural colour landmarks, merely because we have names for them. But these colours shade into one another gradually, and some peoples have names for what we should consider the intermediate colours, while they have none for what we call the primary. We may adduce another instance from the classifications of the stars into constellations. To one, knowing nothing of astronomy, the heavens present the aspect of stars scattered completely at random, both as to sizes and distances. The mythological ancients, however, saw in this random collection strange configurations of animals with weird and fanciful shapes. After we have become accustomed to it we also see the stars in their mythological grouping; and in fact, find it difficult to dissociate the stars of a well-known constellation such as the Great Bear. Yet, if a logical modern mind had to classify the heavens without previous mythological bias, he would do it on a far more prosaic plan. The groupings of stars which we should then see would be totally different from the groupings which we now see. And so it is with all knowledge. The associations of primitive man are not less intellectual than ours: but they are formed under another aegis: they are not controlled by the god of logic, but by other gods less serviceable in material life.

We see, then, that there is a deep emotional difference between primitive and civilised man, as well as a difference in the power to concentrate attention; and precisely the same differences are to be observed in a minor way among ourselves. Some of us are born to look at things from the view of logic: others from different points of view. As for concentration, it has been said that genius is merely the capacity for taking pains. It is almost true: genius is the capacity for attention, very powerfully and continuously concentrated. Probably however this capacity is an original endowment which would not be felt as 'taking pains': and probably no voluntary painstaking could ever rival the congenital tendency to intense mental concentration. Thus primitive man lacks the cardinal element in genius.

Mr. Boas gives some very excellent examples of the way in which we attribute emotional differences to an intellectual origin. We object to seeing a man eating cheese with a knife, and we assign as the ground of our objection the fear that he should cut his tongue. Yet the danger of his cutting his tongue is slight: the real fact is that we dislike an unaccustomed method of consuming food. Again, we consider it rude if our guest at dinner smacks his lips as he eats. The American-Indians think it rude not to do so, for it would be taken as a sign of indifference.

We assign various reasons for not eating certain kinds of food, such as dogs, or caterpillars, or mice. Yet any of these might be good, so far as we know: the foundation of our objection is purely emotional. Many peoples make use of an insect diet. On the other hand, among certain tribes there is a fish taboo: the people look upon fish-eating as we might upon eating snakes. Yet most of us have no ground for the belief that snakes are less agreeable than fish. The practice of cannibalism is also completely dependent on emotional undevelopement: for human flesh is known to be an excellent viand. Our characters are made by emotion, not by intellect: and it is in emotional capacity that we see the great differences between primitive and civilised men.

One of the most important reasons for studying the past is in order to help us to prophesy the future. What are we to learn as to our own future, from a study of the extinct races of the past? We are struck by one great fact. Just as historical nations and empires have never been immortal but have always reached their term and made way for other nations and empires, so prehistoric types of men have marked one stage in human progress, and sunk out of sight as other types arose.

> ' . . . All the world's a stage,
> And all the men and women merely players:
> They have their exits and their entrances,' etc.

Races, like empires and like individuals, are mortal. They have to die and are replaced by other races. So we may infer that the people of the great Steel Age will have to perish, just as the people of the Stone Age and the Bronze Age perished before them. But where are the people to replace them? The Neolithic people were growing to maturity in one part of the earth while their Palaeolithic predecessors were decorating the walls of their caves in Western Europe. But we people of the Steel Age have left no corner of the earth unexplored.

We hold the key to material power, and no people of a later-steel age could compete with us. Perhaps therefore we are the last phase in the evolution of man. When we become extinct, either through the consumption of natural resources, or much more probably through physical degeneration, the earth will once more be abandoned to lower animals. They again will slowly become extinct as the internal heat of the earth is dissipated : so that not only nations, races, and species are impermanent, but Life itself also must have an end. We think with pity of the last survivor of the extinct race of Tasmanians, who died in 1877. How can we picture to ourselves the last representative of the human species ? And must we then believe that the earth will roll on infinitely into the future, a permanent cemetery, disturbed only by occasional collisions with other heavenly bodies ? We do not know.

Art. VI.—LAUGHTER.

1. *Lectures on the English Comic Writers.* By William Hazlitt. 1818.

2. *The Physiology of Laughter.* By Herbert Spencer. 'Macmillan's Magazine.' March 1860. 'Collected Essays.' Vol. II.

3. *An Essay on Comedy.* By George Meredith. 1877.

4. *An Essay on Laughter.* By James Sully, M.A., LL.D. London: Longmans. 1902.

5. *Laughter: An Essay on the Meaning of the Comic.* By Henri Bergson. Translated by Cloudesley Brereton and Fred Rothwell. London: Macmillan. 1911.

Why do we smile to see a child put on his father's hat, or laugh when we hear of Falstaff being dumped into the river with the dirty linen? Why is it that at any quaint idea; an odd collocation of words or thoughts; a particular way of doing or saying a thing; a neat surprise; or an appropriate incongruity, a feeling of pleasure begins to steal over us which instantly tends to express itself by certain muscular contractions round the mouth and eyes, rising, if the occasion be sufficiently amusing, into more or less convulsive movements of the diaphragm and respiratory organs producing audible laughter? It may be true that we laugh at incongruity, or the humiliations of others, but no less truly do we laugh from pure joy and high spirits. In any case, what is the connexion between a feeling of pleasure, or the perception of incongruity and the peculiar bodily manifestations to which they give rise? What element is there in common between the triumphant roar of the victorious fighter and the hollow grin of envy; the hearty guffaw at buffoonery and the nervous giggle of the shy; the screaming laugh of the tickled child and the smile of wisdom? We all laugh, if not from the heart, we must at least pretend, even if we cannot produce more than the 'rire du bout des dents,' as the French expressively call it, for who would be thought incapable of appreciating a joke? At times laughter seizes us in its contagious grip however inopportune the moment—it is not to be denied—the apt drollery carries all before it.

'Once my Lord Bishop looked grave at your jest;
But your next remark set him off with the rest.'

From the savage to the latest product of civilisation, from the yokel to the intellectualist, however wide the difference of the exciting cause, the mode of greeting the ludicrous differs only in degree. At one end of the scale, buffoonery, practical jokes rough and cruel, arouse merriment; at the other, jokes of so rarefied an atmosphere that it is indeed the very elect who can detect the humorous savour. Such, for example, as the illustration that Schopenhauer put forward when discussing the theory of the comic. He thought it as well to help the weaker spirit to appreciate his arguments, and so instanced the funny and amusing appearance of a tangent touching a circle.* We are supposed to laugh here as we reflect on the angle which we see, which is really irreconcilable with the idea of a meeting of a tangent and a curved line. This may illustrate his theory that the origin of the ludicrous lies in the incongruity of what is thought and what is perceived, but it will not win a laugh from many.

From Aristotle onwards, few of the great thinkers have been able to keep off some attempt to explain the baffling problem of laughter, for to explain the nature of laughter and tears is to account for the conditions of human life. Generally however the results are not satisfying. Beauty itself is easier to define than the comic. It is too many sided not to slip out of any definition however ingeniously contrived. The things at which we laugh are as wide as life itself; we can catalogue and describe them to any length we please, but in the end the only real criterion is in the result. We may contrive an elaborate jest conformable to all the rules, nicely compounded of incongruities and surprises, only to find it fall flat. If a thing makes us laugh, if it has that direct appeal to some innate faculty of appreciation, which calls for the responsive mirth it is funny, at all events to the laugher. The power of appreciation is capable of training, it can be modified by habit and custom, but in the end our feeling for the comic is individual like that of taste; if I like a thing, no one can say I am wrong in describing it as nice, however little others may like it. So that is funny which makes me laugh. We can however find certain general conditions and broad principles which cover certain wide realms of the ludicrous by which we may get a more intelligible idea of the field of the comic.

* From 'An essay on Laughter,' by J. Sully.

When Hobbes stated that ' the passion of laughter is nothing ' else but sudden glory arising from sudden conception of some ' eminency in ourselves by comparison with the inferiority of ' others, or with our own formerly,' he certainly put his finger upon a very large factor in the realm of laughter. ' Dans ' l'adversité de nos meilleurs amis, nous trouvons toujours ' quelque chose qui ne nous déplaît pas '—so La Rochefoucauld traces a similar feeling. When we come shortly to discuss the origin of laughter and its developement, we shall see how naturally this subtle pleasure caused by self-feeling or enhancement power would tend to express itself in laughter. Professor Bain again lays stress on this aspect of laughter, defining the occasion of the ludicrous as ' the degradation of some person ' or interest possessing dignity in circumstances that excite no ' other strong emotion.' This is quoted by Professor Sully, who points out that it is an improvement upon the rather blunt form in which Hobbes' principle is stated—since the consciousness of our own superiority need not come in ; the object degraded need not be a person, and also draws attention to the need for the absence of counteracting emotions. It is, however, clear that this leaves out of account very large fields ; for even if we are able to bring into it the greater number of simple incongruities, it entirely leaves out of account the laughter of pure joy, such as we see in children and youth, the laughter that accompanies relief from strain and anxiety. Still more it does little to connect the peculiar bodily reaction which accompanies the recognition of incongruities and the pleasurable feeling of self-elation. The movements of the facial and abdominal muscles, as involuntary as the motions of breathing, point back clearly to some very early period of developement. The fact that in the phenomena of tickling we get laughter produced as a purely physiological reflex, so unconnected with mental appreciation that it has been detected appearing as early as the seventh week of life, again offers the strongest evidence that in the movements of laughter we have a reaction that must have appeared very early in the history of the race. At a later stage, when associations have been formed consciously, it would be natural enough and explicable by ordinary laws, that mental suggestion should either intensify or inhibit laughter, which was originally the direct result of physical stimulation.

If we are to get any light upon this aspect of laughter, we must turn for a time from the mental and intellectual aspect of it to physiology.

Herbert Spencer suggested in his ' Physiology of Laughter ' an explanation which, upon its main lines still, perhaps,

offers the most plausible and satisfactory description of what may be termed the mechanism of laughter.

He points out that nervous excitation always tends to beget muscular movement; roughly speaking there are main channels along which nerves in a state of tension may discharge themselves. They may pass on the excitement to other nerves that have no direct connexion with bodily members, and so cause other feelings and ideas; they may pass it on to one or more of the motor nerves and so cause muscular contractions; or they may pass the excitement on to the nerves controlling the various internal functions. Generally, we may suppose, that the discharge would take place along all three, but in different and varying proportions. An agreeable state of feeling caused by good news, or praise, or success, is not wholly used up in arousing the succeeding phases of the feeling and the appropriate new ideas, but a certain amount of it overflows into the visceral nervous system, increasing the action of the heart, and probably facilitating digestion.

We must then assume that at any moment the existing quantity of liberated nerve force which in some way, little understood, produces in us the state we call feeling, must expand itself in some direction, and if of several channels one or more is closed, or partially closed, the discharge along the remaining one must be more intense. Laughter is a display of muscular excitement and so illustrates the general law that feeling when it passes a certain pitch vents itself in bodily action. It is not a sense of the ludicrous only; there is sardonic laughter, hysterical laughter from mental distress, laughter from tickling, and, under certain conditions, from cold and certain kinds of pain.

If now we have this overflow of nerve force, undirected by any particular motive, it will manifestly take the most habitual route. It is through the organs of speech that feeling passes into movement with the greatest frequency. The muscles round the mouth, small and easy to move, are the first to contract under pleasurable emotion. The class of muscles, which may be considered next most easily set in action by feelings of all kinds, are those of respiration. We breathe more quickly under excitement of any kind, so that it is not difficult to see the likelihood of convulsive movements of the respiratory organs being set up. If the feeling still continues and increases the muscles of the upper limbs are set in motion, the hands are rubbed together or clapped, the knees slapped, the body is swayed backwards and forwards. Roughly speaking, then, we see that the feeling excites to muscular

action, and that when the muscular action is unguided by purpose the muscles first affected are those most habitually stimulated, followed in due course by the others.

There still remains, as Spencer points out, the question as to how and why laughter should follow the perception of incongruity, as the foregoing explanation would only account for the laughter caused by acute pleasure or pain.

'This cause we shall arrive at by carrying our analysis a step further. We have but to consider the quantity of feeling that exists under such circumstances, and then to ask what are the conditions that determine the direction of its discharge, to at once reach a solution. Take a case. You are sitting in a theatre absorbed in the process of an interesting drama. Some climax has been reached which has aroused your sympathies—say a reconciliation between the hero and heroine, after long and painful misunderstanding. The feelings excited by this scene are not of a kind from which you seek relief; but are, on the contrary, a grateful relief from the painful feelings with which you have witnessed the previous estrangement. Moreover, the sentiments these fictitious personages have for the moment inspired in you are not such as would lead you to rejoice in any indignity offered to them; but, rather, such as would make you resent the indignity. And now, while you are contemplating the reconciliation with a pleasurable sympathy, there appears from behind the scenes a tame kid which, having stared round at the audience, walks up to the lovers and stares at them. You cannot help joining in the roar which greets this contretemps. Inexplicable as is this irresistible burst on the hypothesis of a pleasure in escaping from mental restraint, or on the hypothesis of a pleasure from relative increase of self-importance when witnessing the humiliation of others, it is readily explicable if we consider what, in such a case, must become of the feeling that existed at the moment the incongruity arose. A large mass of emotion had been produced; or to speak in physiological language, a large portion of the nervous system was in a state of tension. There was also great expectation with respect to the further evolution of the scene—a quantity of vague, nascent thought and emotion, with which the existing quantity of thought and emotion was about to pass. Had there been no interruption, the body of new ideas and feelings next excited would have sufficed to absorb the whole of the liberated nervous energy. But now, this large amount of nervous energy instead of being allowed to expand itself in producing an equivalent amount of new thoughts and emotions which were nascent, is suddenly checked in its flow. The channels along which the discharge was about to take place are closed. The new channel opened—that afforded by the appearance and proceedings of the kid—is a small one; the ideas and feelings suggested are not numerous and massive enough to carry off the nervous energy to be expanded. The excess must therefore discharge itself in some other direction;

there results an efflux through the motor nerves to various classes of muscles, producing the half-convulsive actions we term laughter.'*

We do not then laugh simply at any incongruity but when the unexpected state of feeling aroused is less in intensity, so leaving us, as it were, with something in hand to be expanded —i.e. when the attention is transferred from something greater to something smaller—and this Herbert Spencer describes as 'descending incongruity.' A simple example will make this clear. If we watch a door opening slowly with the full expectation of the entrance of some imposing and important personage, and then instead there trots in a small dog or some quite unimportant and insignificant person—we laugh. We were prepared adequately for the greater event and we have a supply of nervous energy over. If, on the other hand, we reverse the process and the incongruity is of a marked degree of the opposite kind—i.e. unexpectedly important—we are left with an insufficient stock of nervous energy and are more likely to be left motionless, with our mouths open, until we have time to recover ourselves.

If the foregoing explanation of the physiological process of laughter cannot be considered proved, it has at any rate the merit of a high degree of plausibility; but, however satisfactory, it is really rather a description of a process than an explanation. It tells us how we laugh and suggests why the emotion once aroused should be outwardly expressed in that particular form; but it does not tell us how it comes about that a feeling of relative superiority, for example, should give rise to a feeling of pleasure. The misfortunes of even our best friends may not be devoid of pleasure; but what is the connexion between the humiliations of others and a feeling of pleasure in ourselves? Why should a breach of etiquette, or a social lapse, give rise to a sufficient sense of pleasure in the onlooker to cause a smile or a laugh? In short, what has been the use of laughter in the past? Has it had a value in the struggle for existence? It is difficult to believe that a feeling so widespread and powerful, so instinctive and innate, could ever have survived or been so highly developed, unless it had had a strongly marked survival value.

We have seen how laughter became the natural outlet and expression of the feeling produced by anything which caused an increase of nervous excitation without offering any opportunity or need for action or other emotion, or when the other

* The Physiology of Laughter. Essays, vol. ii. pp. 113–114.

channels were not sufficient to exhaust it. Thus it naturally becomes peculiarly attached to pleasures enjoyed by the person, as onlooker or auditor, since he is at the moment passive, but has somehow to discharge the excitement.

To human beings in a primitive and backward condition, developed in and accustomed to a narrow and restricted environment, anything novel or unusual had to be regarded with suspicion as a possible, or probable, source of danger. The usual, the accustomed, whether in food or objects, was the safer, was that for which the particular faculties and qualities had been developed to meet.

Instant need of care not unmixed with apprehension would promptly brace up—bringing into readiness a certain supply of nervous energy—the individual who noticed anything novel or abnormal, in case there was something dangerous to be dealt with. At the same time he would, by the instinct of curiosity, be impelled to investigate in case it might turn out valuable; for simple avoidance of all novelty would be a complete bar to progress. If, then, the apparent novelty turned out to be some harmless familiar object, or something of unimportance, not requiring action there would be left the uncalled upon but just excited nervous energy calling for discharge, giving of course the usual pleasant sensation of power and well-being.

Laughter due to some such sudden relief from tension as just described is very common. Kant, indeed, has described it in this sense: 'Laughter is the result of an expectation, 'which of a sudden ends in nothing.' In its simple form it can be well exemplified in children. If we hold a mask before our face and approach a child with this disguise on, it will at first be inclined to smile at the oddity of it; but if, without saying a word, we go steadily nearer and nearer, it begins to be alarmed and half inclined to cry; but if at that moment we remove the mask and show a well-known face behind, the sudden relief from tension is shown in shrieks of laughter. We can imagine this laughter in a cruder form, as the victor in some fierce personal combat, having thrown or killed his foe, suddenly finding no further need for exertion, would express his relief and discharge his accumulated excitements in shouts of exultant and derisive laughter. In such a case there is not only the pleasure of relief from tension, but the keen delight of proved superiority. As our pleasures are, roughly speaking, always proportional to the value in the struggle for existence of the instincts from which they are derived, so there are few keener human delights than that of getting the better of one's competitors, and anything which

gives us evidence of our own superiority is always regarded as pleasing and is, as we have already seen, one of the most fertile sources of laughter. So much so, indeed, as to have been considered, if not the only cause, at least an invariable ingredient. 'Strange as the genealogy may seem, the original 'parentage of that wonderful and delicious mixture of fun, 'fancy, philosophy and feeling which constitutes modern 'humour was probably the cruel mockery of a savage at the 'writhings of a suffering enemy.' *

This is the basis of Hobbes' 'sudden glory' theory referred to above, and, of course, accounts for the use of laughter as a sign of derision and contempt. We generally assume that to laugh at a person is to express one's sense of superiority, and explains why ridicule is so galling and hard to bear. Few are the people who have sufficient strength and determination to withstand the combined laughter of their associates. It is in this use of laughter that we see how valuable is the part it has played in developement. As a means of preserving the customary, the conventional, whether in dress, habits or ordinary usages of society, laughter stands unrivalled. Among savage tribes living in primitive conditions, just developing social habits and the power gained by living in communities, adherence to the tribal systems was imperative. Any originality or individual action would be fatal to the concerted action necessary to secure success in the struggle with other tribes. Consequently we find among backward and uncultivated tribes what has been described as an 'almost incredible conservatism.' All their ceremonies, dress, elaborate rites and customs of marriage, birth and death are handed down with scrupulous fidelity, and hallowed by long usage and the sanction of religion. Where the rites are magic nothing can be omitted, for who can be sure in just what point the strength of the spell may lie. In any backward people we see the same tendency—the fact that their fathers did a thing in a particular way is considered ample reason for following the same method, and all new-fangled notions are laughed to scorn. Up to a certain point it is quite clearly an indispensable instinct for safety. Deviation in any important point probably met with death, but tribes which were able to cure their more eccentric members by a less wasteful method than killing them would obviously have an advantage. So when the onlookers saw any member of the tribe who failed to dress correctly, or to carry out some appropriate ceremony, or deviating in any way from the accepted

* George Eliot, 'Essays,' quoted by Sully.

code, they would, we may imagine, at first be caught by surprise, with perhaps a momentary apprehension, rapidly dissolved into a feeling of relief and a sense of superiority as they recognised that the cause was ignorance or inability to do the thing in exactly the right way, and this feeling would of course tend to discharge itself in laughter. The same series of tension, doubt, slight bewilderment, succeeded by a satisfactory feeling of superiority, would be gone through at the sight of a stranger with his differences of dress, language, and behaviour. The process we may believe to be practically unconscious, merely leaving the resultant feeling which would arise almost simultaneously with the perceptions giving the impression of the thing being funny. Those quickest to note any incongruity would have the additional pleasure caused by the tribute to their superiority, and this would itself act as a spur and make a tendency to note and seize upon incongruities of all kinds. Laughter as the chastiser of social lapses, as the best and readiest means of forcing adherence to certain codes of behaviour necessary for any social community, has always held an unrivalled position from which it is unlikely to be dislodged.

We may, indeed, go so far as to say that most people, especially the less well educated and widely experienced, are very apt to regard anything which is different to what they are accustomed as *ipso facto* inferior and to laugh at it. At the same time it is clear that, as has been already pointed out, unless novelty could be appreciated and made use of, progress would be impossible. Hence we see two rival instincts at work, curiosity, a desire to investigate anything novel on the one hand, and, on the other, the fear and apprehension of the unknown. The valuable conservative tendency to preserve that which has proved itself the safer against the progressive desire for novelty. The result of this is easily observed in the caution with which the new is received, but if it becomes possible to absorb it, to fit it into its place with preconceived notions and to make use of it, the fear or contempt gives place to a pleased appreciation, and if this refers to something of small importance not calling for any other action or emotion it will be simply greeted with a smile or laugh of pleasure as some unexpected but neat and effective connexion becomes apparent. Looking at pleasure for the moment from the strictly biological point of view, we see it simply as the sign and, so to speak, criterion which shows that the actions or conditions are, broadly speaking, of a beneficial character to the individual or the race, since any individual who found unwholesome and unsuitable things

pleasant would be rapidly eliminated. Pleasure is always a concomitant of increased vitality or enhanced energy, and we have already seen that where no other or more appropriate outlet. or one not enough to exhaust the supply, offers itself it tends to discharge itself in smiles and laughter. The universal recognition of the laugh as a sign of joy and pleasure would tend to make the very sound itself increase the effect by suggestion and to impart the feeling to others.

It is easy to see how naturally laughter would at once tend to become a means of expression, its infectiousness is proverbial, it requires more than one for real enjoyment of a joke. As M. Bergson says, laughter requires an echo. It is essentially social and its use and value depends on its power of spreading and bringing in others. To see people laughing will generally cause the onlooker to smile, though without any idea as to what the joke is. There is little doubt that much of the value of laughter, and consequently the cause of further developement, lies in this power of sympathetically uniting a group by a kind of freemasonry of common jokes ; a smile or a laugh is made use of intentionally to express good will and a desire to be friendly.

As is the case of many of our old instincts, which have become involved and confused in the complexity of civilisation and adult life, we can trace many of them with tolerable clearness in the case of children. Children laugh freely from a mere sense of physical well-being and overflowing energy ; they laugh at any novelty or unusual arrangement as soon as they are satisfied that it is not going to hurt them. They laugh if they see anyone else laugh ; they laugh if they meet anyone they know unexpectedly ; and as their power of imaginative sympathy is not as a rule strongly developed they are apt to exhibit very clearly the tendency to laugh at other persons in difficulties or unpleasant situations. Although children exhibit the various forms of laughter very freely, it is generally granted that they are deficient in what is called a sense of humour, and it is interesting to note that just as by increasing knowledge and education the child grows from the ready hilarity of youth into the appreciation of wit and humour, so we see the early form of laughter to which we have been alluding develope into the complicated enjoyment of various forms of intellectual amusement. The step is undoubtedly a long one, but it is not difficult to see how it comes about if we compare it for a moment with the source and developement of other forms of pleasure, in which an originally physical enjoyment becomes, if not always, an intellectual delight, at least far removed from its

original manifestation. In taste it is clear enough that the original basis of our likes and dislikes is due to the necessity, during the process of evolution, of finding wholesome body-building foods nice, and the unwholesome nasty, so that unconsciously the right food is selected by the pleasure produced in consuming it. Having the natural likes and dislikes, we find endless skill and trouble devoted to increasing and multiplying the pleasure by diversity and contrast. The sense of taste being, as it is said, educated as it learns to discriminate more closely and to find and like more and more flavours. Rhythmical sound was found to cause a curious enhancement of vigour and with it the sense of pleasure, and so opportunities were sought of enjoying this and elaborating it, and so from being merely a useful means of ensuring concerted action music came to be a mere pleasure of the ear. So with colours and forms the original natural liking is developed and diversified until by training and custom the final forms which are taken become very far removed from the original manifestations. Through all our pleasures we can trace the gradual steps by which they pass, from the simple unconscious reaction in which the pleasure is originally due to some action beneficial to the individual or the race, into the stage when the mind noticing the pleasure deliberately provides opportunities for its enjoyment, and so by slow degrees the enjoyment becomes more and more one of the mind and more and more removed from its natural cause, until not only is the useful origin overlooked but often denied altogether, and the pleasure is considered to be entirely intellectual, although the bodily reactions, quickened circulation, alterations of respiration, etc., are there, however little we may consciously be aware of them. So in the case of laughter. Originally the expression of simple physical well-being, it becomes the outward expression of pleasure and as the pleasures become more intellectualised so it tends more and more to express simple pleasure in things of the mind and in ideas. As it was found that unexpected connexions, forms of incongruity, a slight moment of tension relieved by turning into nothing, the production of a sudden call up of nervous energy with nothing to make any demand upon it, did—for the reasons we have just been considering—give rise to a feeling of pleasure, so it followed that, as in the case of all our other pleasures, opportunities were sought, and endless ingenuity devoted to contriving appropriate causes to produce this form of pleasure. Just as in the case of art or music, heredity, training, habit, custom would largely determine what form incongruities or novelties would have the quickest and strongest appeal, these

would be more developed, and new kinds continually developed. What any particular individual would find funny would be to some extent a matter of idiosyncrasy just as much as taste, but as men are, speaking roughly and generally, built much on the same lines, with similar training and tradition, so there would be a natural consensus as to finding certain things ludicrous, and allowing us to formulate to some extent canons or rules with regard to the comic, as the canons of art and law, of design represent what has been proved by experience to be the most generally acceptable form in art. As people become more intellectual the appeal must become more subtle, the coarse, strong-tasting food, the garish colours that delight the uneducated appeal to the more refined as little as the buffoonery and practical jokes that were once dignified under the title of humour.

Just as writers upon art usually start with the assumption that we have an innate natural faculty of taste which responds to beauty and so enables us to detect and appreciate it, without pausing to enquire why we should have such a faculty at all, so writers upon the ludicrous start from the fact that we laugh at what is funny, and hurry on to the more congenial task of analysing and classifying the ludicrous. Professor Sully's book must however be exempted from any such charge, for, although he does not bring forward any very novel theory or explanation, he discusses fully and impartially the origin and developement of laughter in all its aspects. On the other hand M. Bergson's book on laughter, published some nine years ago in France, which has just been made accessible to English readers in an admirable translation, should perhaps be described rather as an essay upon certain aspects of the comic, since the scope of the word has been somewhat limited for the purpose of his analysis. It deals with one variety of laughter and that in a somewhat narrow fashion, giving us rather a descriptive explanation of the kind of things that cause laughter than a reason why we laugh. He offers us a number of what might be termed laws, but puts them forward rather as provisional theories than full explanations.

The main thesis of M. Bergson's book is that we laugh at anything or anybody which suggests to us the rigidity or mechanical automatism of a machine in the actions or words of a human being. In fact he attempts to reduce all form of the ludicrous to a substitution in our movements, speech, or action of the rigidity (*raideur*) of some kind of mechanism for the pliancy and variability of an organism. To put it in M. Bergson's own words with regard to the comic in movements,

'the attitudes, gestures, and movements of the human body 'are laughable in exact proportion as that body reminds 'us of a mere machine.'

The writer, in a series of brilliant and ingenious analyses of various comic situations and ideas, succeeds in showing how his principle will work. A caricature is funny because it suggests a unique and permanent grimace actuated by some mechanical device in place of the changing pliancy of life. A man, running along the street stumbles and falls; the passers-by burst out laughing, not because they thought he wished suddenly to sit down but because it was involuntary. There may have been a step or a stone in the road: instead of avoiding the obstacle or altering his pace, through a lack of elasticity, and a kind of absent-minded physical obstinacy, as a result in fact of rigidity or momentum, the muscles continued to perform the same movement when some adaptable alteration was really required.

The essence of M. Bergson's whole system of philosophy lies in the view of life as a continual change of aspect. The opposite of this is the unchanging repetition of the machine-automatism; absence of adaptability is in a high degree anti-social and out of touch with life, and therefore continues to fall under the lash of ridicule.

M. Bergson starts with three observations upon the ludicrous in general which he puts forward as fundamental. The first is that the comic does not exist outside the pale of what is human, for whether we laugh at an animal, or an inanimate object, it is only when we endow them with human qualities that they appear as funny. M. Bergson points out that it is odd that this important fact appears to have escaped the notice of philosophers, but it is open to doubt whether it really bears the emphasis that he puts upon it. It appears rather to be simply, as far as it is true, inherent in the nature of the case; we must see a meaning or idea to get the comic element, and we can only put a meaning into anything by expressing it in terms of what we know and feel; so the savage naturally credits any inanimate object with human qualities. There is of course a rich field for examples of 'descending incongruity' in attributing, or pretending to attribute, life to an inanimate object.

Secondly, he lays stress upon the necessity for absence of feeling; the appeal of the comic is to intelligence alone. It is as well to remember that the comic alluded to by M. Bergson is somewhat limited, since it is not possible to eliminate feeling from all forms of laughter.

Thirdly, laughter requires more than one; it must be shared by others, and so has its greatest significance as a social force. 'The rigid, the ready-made, the mechanical, in contrast with 'the supple, the everchanging and the living; absentminded-'ness in contrast with attention; in a word, automatism in 'contrast with free activity, such are the defects that laughter 'singles out and would fain correct.' *

It is this view of laughter as a corrective that plays a large part in M. Bergson's essay, and is accentuated by the fact that the illustrations are drawn for the most part out of the French comedies, from Molière to Labiche. This not only throws into relief the satirical side of the comic but gives him certain sharp, rather clear-cut types held up to ridicule as examples and warnings. Too much emphasis seems to be placed on the unkind aspect of laughter.

'Laughter is, above all a corrective. Being intended to humiliate, it must make a painful impression on the person against whom it is directed. By laughter, society avenges itself for the liberties taken with it. It would fail in its object if it bore the stamp of sympathy and kindness.' †

The attention is so much directed to the view of the comic as satire castigating the follies of mankind that it almost suggests that were everyone wise and sensible laughter would disappear. Sympathetic laughter; the laugh of kindly humour; the smiles of joy and pleasure; the laughter caused by tickling, which has to be accounted for in any theory of laughter, all remain outside the field surveyed.

It is interesting to note that the comic element in the contrast between the human and the mechanical had already struck Hazlitt,‡ who pointed out that 'the popular entertain-'ment of Punch and the puppet show owes part of its irresistible 'and universal attraction to nearly the same principle of 'inspiring inanimate and mechanical agents with sense and 'consciousness.'

However true it may be that it is laughable to discover 'something mechanical encrusted on the living,' it is extremely difficult to see how the principle can describe more than a part of the vast field of the comic. Indeed when we see the ingenuity required by M. Bergson to make it cover such simple cases of the ludicrous as wearing incongruous clothes, or having

* Laughter, p. 130.
† Ibid. p. 197.
‡ Lectures on the English Comic Writers.

an unusually red nose, we are forced to the conclusion that M. Bergson has been so struck by a certain aspect or part of the comic that he has taken it to cover the whole.

So far we have attempted to keep in view the broader and more general aspect of laughter, but among the more educated people there is a tendency to mean, when the question of the comic is discussed, the particular aspect of it usually described under the head of wit and humour. If we listen to ordinary conversation or any form of social gathering or unexpected meetings of friends we notice the tendency to continual laughter and smiles; as a rule there is hardly anything in the nature of actual jokes, and the laughter for the most part represents merely the discharge of nervous energy, and the obviously natural use of the laugh as a means of expression. If a laugh or smile represents a feeling of pleasure it, of course, tends to be produced intentionally in order to suggest pleasantness on both sides. In addition to this there is the intentional desire to amuse both in conversation and in writing, and this is what is meant by the term wit and humour. The two words are usually put together, though the difference between them is wide and much ingenuity has been expended in defining them in such a way as to bring out the distinction. Hazlitt, in his lecture on 'Wit and Humour,' thus compares them:

'Humour is the describing the ludicrous as it is in itself; wit is the exposing it, by comparing or contrasting it with something else. Humour is, as it were, the growth of nature and accident; wit is the product of art and fancy. Humour, as it is shown in books, is an imitation of the natural or acquired absurdities of mankind, or of the ludicrous in accident, situation, and character; wit is the illustrating and heightening the sense of that absurdity by some sudden and unexpected likeness or opposition of one thing to another, which sets off the quality we despise in a still more contemptible or striking point of view.' *

Professor Lilly, in a lecture upon 'The Theory of the Ludi-'crous,' † suggests that the difference lies in the fact that Wit specially implies Understanding (Verstand)—while Humour has most in common with Reason (Vernunft). Probably the difference to most people lies in the idea that wit particularly implies cleverness, a quick and nimble adroitness in seeing and bringing together unexpected points of resemblance between things apparently widely separated, or in suggesting some incongruity or oddity by a coincidence of sound or different

* Lectures on the English Comic Writers.

† Essays on Literature and Religion. 1904.

meanings of one word; so that often we appreciate and admire wit without any inclination to laugh, looking at it more as an example of clever and inventive ingenuity than as humour. Humour represents rather a point of view or attitude of mind, and so indicative in a way of the general character, a more permanent quality than wit, which is generally the result of deliberate and conscious effort. Of course the two are continually mixed and exhibited at the same moment, but a person may be witty, and may laugh uproariously and continually at anything and everything, and yet be without any real sense of humour, whilst another gifted with a keen appreciation of humour may seldom go beyond a smile. The late Mr. Traill, in an article in the 'Fortnightly Review,' * maintained that wit and humour resulted from two diametrically opposed operations of the mind, on the ground that wit consists in the revelation of unsuspected similarity between two otherwise dissimilar objects of thought, while humour consists in the display (though not necessarily the revelation) of incongruity between two otherwise associable objects of thought.

The word humour has had a somewhat curious history. Originally it meant the temperament of a man, his predominant mood or affection. When Shakespeare calls a man humorous, he means that he is changeable, capricious, passing easily from one mood to another. A humorist was a man who exhibited as an actor or mimic various characters, and thus for long retained its flavour of buffoonery. Goldsmith, writing in 1759, says 'Wit raises human nature above its level; humour acts 'a contrary part and equally depresses it.' Sydney Smith, in his lectures about wit and humour, states that humour consists in 'discovering incongruity between ideas which excite surprise, 'and surprise alone.' But the value of this definition is much diminished when we see what Sydney Smith considered as humorous. He gives some examples, such as a corpulent and respectable tradesman, somewhat ostentatiously dressed, sliding down gently into the mud; the overturning of a dinner-table with all the dinner upon it, and so on; but these really do not come into what we should now consider as true examples of humour; they are more related to buffoonery. No doubt the great humorous writers of the nineteenth century did much to raise the meaning of the word to a more dignified position. It was found that writers such as Dickens, Thackeray, Jane Austen, Lamb, Scott, and so on, not only gave the keenest pleasure and amusement, but that they contained also something

* The Analytical Humourist. July 1896.

worthier than the mere grotesque or caricature of human foibles. When readers began to find themselves the better for what was called humorous writing, they naturally began to treat humour with more respect and to realise that there were qualities invoked which were more desirable and of more permanent value than mere funniness.

So that the word humorous, like the luckless word artistic, still has to cover a very wide range of very divergent things. The knockabout business on the music-hall stage is even now described as a humorous interlude; a person who delights in practical jokes and buffoonery of all kinds is also as likely as not to be described as humorous; but, at the same time, as soon as we use the expression 'sense of humour' it is widely recognised as at once defining and limiting the use of the word in a peculiar way. It betokens a certain kindly, tolerant, broad-minded point of view, keenly alive to inconsistencies and incongruities, quick to note and to place in a view where they become patent the small failings and absurdities, but at the same time with a sympathetic understanding which suggests a nature large enough to see the faults and yet not to be repelled by them.

Thackeray in opening his lectures on the English humorous writers describes humour as 'wit mixed with love,' and adds: 'The humorous writer professes to awaken and direct your 'love, your pity, your kindness; your scorn for untruth, 'pretension, imposture; your tenderness for the weak, the 'poor, the oppressed, the unhappy. He takes upon himself to 'be the week-day preacher, so to speak.'

Here we have indeed a different picture of humour from that suggested by Sydney Smith, from the 'agreeable raillery and 'facetious remark' which the word used to convey. It must be remembered at the same time that although a writer like Goldsmith described humour as degrading human nature, he gave himself in his own writings notable examples of humour in its best form and was particularly selected by Thackeray for special notice. The quality was there, but there was no specific term by which to recognise it.

'You may estimate your capacity for comic perception (says Meredith *) by being able to detect the ridicule of them you love without loving them less; and more by being able to see yourself somewhat ridiculous in dear eyes, and accepting the correction their image of you proposes.

---

* An Essay on Comedy.

'If you detect the ridicule, and your kindliness is chilled by it, you are stepping into the grasp of satire.

'If you laugh all round him, tumble him, roll him about, deal him a smack, and drop a tear on him, over his likeness to you and yours to your neighbour, spare him as little as you shun, pity him as much as you expose, it is a spirit of Humour that is moving you.'

It has become somewhat of a commonplace to point out the kindly and sympathetic feature in humour, and there is a risk that too much emphasis is laid upon the point. For it truly is somewhat accidental, due partly to the character of the most widely acknowledged masters and exponents of humour and partly to the nature of the case. For the very essence of the sense of humour is the nicest appreciation and discrimination of slight and subtle incongruities in human nature, and these can only be perceived and noted by one with a very clear idea and knowledge of the normal. To put it more simply, it must be true to nature; the whole point is lost at once unless the writer convinces us that the incident described is true to life, and as the ordinary person is a blend of good and bad there must be as much appreciation of the good as quickness to see the bad. The wide survey necessary to view things in their true proportions and relations will suggest that knowledge which forgives—'Tout savoir c'est tout pardonner.' The worst of Shakespeare's villains have their better moments and their redeeming features.

'It is the paradox of humour that while the idea started, and the word was formed, from an observation of the eccentricities, the grotesquenesses, the abnormal-isms (if I may coin the word) of human nature, it yet depends for its permanent effect on its truthfulness, its fidelity to a certain standard in the humorist's own bosom. Humour, a thing so apparently lawless, yet has laws it cannot disobey. Though ostensibly ridiculing human nature, and so far lowering it, it must really respect the ideal human nature from which it portrays mainly the deflections.' *

The real fact appears to be that when we speak of humour in the widest and best sense of the term we do not merely mean a lively sense of the comic tempered by kindly feeling, but we refer rather to a much more subtle, delicately discriminating sense of incongruity, the power to see the abnormal and the absurd, or rather to notice by observing things in

* Canon Ainger, 'Lectures and Essays' (vol. ii.): True and False Humour.

their larger relations with regard to the things that matter; the power to weigh things by a truer standard than that immediately apparent; to strip off the adventitious and by showing things as they really are to put them a moment in their right position. It then becomes obvious that to do this will require a high order of ability, a well-balanced brain, a wide view and a quick appreciation of the relative points of importance, an apt weighing of probabilities and eventualities; in a word, common sense in the widest meaning of the word, that is the power of keeping a clear-headed, sane point of view. Wisdom and a sense of humour have been always recognised as going naturally together—'the first-born of common sense, 'the vigilant comic, which is the genius of thoughtful laughter' (Meredith).

'Genuine humour and true wit,' says Landor,* 'require a 'sound and capacious mind, which is always a grave one.'

Humour is the outcome of a well-balanced mind and the wider the experience and knowledge the more certain and clear becomes the power of appreciating at their true worth the foibles and inconsistencies of life. Satire loses the sense of proportion as it lashes the vice of society, and has but little in common with humour. Lowell, writing upon Democracy in 1887, alludes to 'that modulating and restraining balance-'wheel which we call a sense of humour.'

It is more or less an accepted fact at the present day that a sense of humour really does imply that sort of balanced common sense which is able to see things in their true proportions. The foregoing considerations naturally explain why it is that everyone desires to be considered as being endowed with a sense of humour. However much difference there may be as to the exact meaning and definition of the word, there is singular unanimity as to its being an indispensable possession. A man will allow that he is not particularly clever or witty, may even admit to a somewhat uncertain temper; but suggest that he is lacking in a sense of humour and he is up in arms at once. As a matter of fact we are all tolerably satisfied that we ourselves are endowed with this quality, however much we may have doubts about our friends and acquaintances. This is due no doubt to the fact that, whether consciously formulated or not, everyone has a feeling to some extent of the qualities that are implied in the expression, a sense of humour.

* Imaginary Conversations: Alfieri and the Jew Saloma, quoted by Meredith, 'Essay on Comedy.'

One thing that does not imply a sense of humour is the faculty of always laughing; few things are more ridiculous than laughter without a cause. A person must be very ignorant or very thoughtless who is surprised at everything he sees or who expects everyone to conform to his standard. To be struck with incongruity in whatever comes before us certainly does not imply great comprehension or refinement of perception, but rather a kind of flippancy of mind incapable of connecting any two ideas steadily together.

In writing that is usually allowed to be endowed with a sense of humour, we generally or frequently find no attempt to be funny or to make jokes and witticisms, but the whole is infused by a subtle but easily recognisable atmosphere, or point of view. It is hardly possible to lay a finger upon the actual word, yet all the time there is an undercurrent of amusement which appears to be due to the very naturalness and truth to nature of the descriptions in which the characters unconsciously reveal their petty foibles and inconsistencies, in a way which seems to have nothing to do with any deliberate intention upon the part of the writer.

With humour we come as it were to the highest branch of the comic, the form that it takes in the thoughtful and reflective mind. It is impossible to draw any line or give any definition which would make it possible to mark off humour from other branches of the comic. It would be as easy to find a line of demarcation between good and bad taste; it is a matter of individual opinion and feeling. We may easily imagine, too, that, whilst it is possible to speculate in theory and describe certain differences and aspects, any particular example at which we laugh is an inextricable compound of many different factors, not the least of which is the actual condition of the auditor at the moment.

> 'A jest's prosperity lies in the ear
> Of him that hears it, never in the tongue
> Of him that makes it.'

A witty remark or apt quotation may at the same time be humorous as well as clever. When Lamb, discoursing lovingly upon the delights of roast sucking-pig, begins to elaborate the idea that the early death involved at least saved the particular individual from growing into the coarseness of the adult pig, he quotes the lines:

> 'Ere sin could blight or sorrow fade
> Death came with timely care.'

There is a whimsically appropriate incongruity in the 'timely' which appeals at once to our sense of the comic. On the other hand, the well-known quotation of Swift's upon the lady's mantle knocking a Cremona violin off the table:

'Mantua vae miserae nimium vicina Cremonae,'

simply leaves us with a cold wonder at the astonishing completeness of it.

A repartee often depends for part of its effect upon the slight shock of the rudeness which is at least as often part of the joke as the neat play upon the words. 'Do you see anything 'ridiculous in this wig?' asked a judge, anxious about his appearance. 'Nothing but the head,' replied a fellow-judge, scoring neatly, if rudely, off the ambiguity of the meaning of 'in.' The touch of humour comes in as the joke reveals some aspect of human nature revealing itself. A wealthy man on his death-bed, and conscious of a not altogether well-spent life, anxiously enquired of his Scotch minister whether he thought that a gift of a large sum of money to his church would make matters easier for him. 'Ah, weel,' replied the honest and cautious minister, 'I'll no be giving any guarantee, but,' anxious not to lose the chance for his church he added, 'it's 'an experiment that's well worth trying.'

Many stories owe their only element of the comic to a suggestion of something *risqué*, an allusion by implication to things not usually mentioned in polite conversation. No doubt this is partly due to a slight feeling of tension or apprehension that the limits of social propriety will be overstepped, which is relieved as the conclusion turns out to be something comparatively harmless, at all events apparently so. There is also the sense of incongruity between the ideas suggested and the circumstances of the moment, and the usual tendency to laugh at a breach of convention. But apart from the stories with a *double entente*, there are those that are frankly coarse and indecent told under circumstances when no breach of propriety is likely to be felt. This class of story is undoubtedly a potent cause of laughter. It is a favourite form of wit among savages, and there can be little doubt that the main factor here lies in the fact that the allusions raise a certain degree of pleasurable excitement, especially likely to appeal to a somewhat coarse-fibred nature not easily moved by more subtle appeals.

Stories in dialect seem to have an added richness and savour; the slight unfamiliarity of the word or sound adds an emphasis from the attraction of novelty; creating a momentary tension

and heightening the incongruity, it gives a quaint turn to an otherwise colourless phrase.

Any attempt to describe or classify the various forms of wit and humour would be a long task for the occasions are as wide as life, and for a definition it is difficult to improve upon that given in Barrow's celebrated description of humour, quoted by Hazlitt.

'But first it may be demanded, what the thing we speak of is, or what this facetiousness doth import; to which question I might reply, as Democritus did to him that asked the definition of a man—'*tis that which we all see and know*; and one better apprehends what it is by acquaintance than I can inform him by description. It is, indeed, a thing so versatile and multiform, appearing in so many shapes, so many postures, so many garbs, so variously apprehended by several eyes and judgements, that it seemeth no less hard to settle a clear and certain notice thereof than to make a portrait of Proteus, or to define the figure of fleeting air.'

Art. VII.—THE PEACE MOVEMENT AND THE HOLY ALLIANCE.

1. *Encyclopædia Britannica.* 11th Edition. 'Peace.' By Sir Thomas Barclay. Cambridge University Press. 1911.
2. *Memoiren.* Bertha von Suttner. Stuttgart and Leipzig: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt. 1909.
3. *Le Passé de la Guerre et l'Avenir de la Paix.* Charles Richet. Paris: Librairie Paul Ollendorff. 1907.
4. *The Passing of War.* By William Leighton Grane. London: Macmillan. 1912.
5. *La seconde Conférence de la Paix.* Ernest Lémonon. With preface by M. Léon Bourgeois. Paris: Librairie générale de droit et de jurisprudence. 1908.
6. *Étude sur les origines de la Sainte Alliance.* E. Muhlenbeck. Paris: E. Bouillon et E. Vieweg. Undated.
7. *Cambridge Modern History.* Vol. x. chap. i. 'The Congresses.' By W. Alison Phillips. Cambridge University Press. 1907.

[Other Works, and unpublished Foreign Office records.]

It may be taken as one among many significant signs of the progress made by the movement in favour of the organisation of international peace that 'Peace' has been made, in the new edition of the 'Encyclopædia Britannica,' the subject of a separate treatise. There is a precedent, indeed, for the heading in the article 'Paix' in Diderot's great 'Encyclopédie'; but this is no more than an eloquent protest against war and plea for peace in the abstract, an elaboration of the text that 'war is a violent and convulsive sickness of the body politic.' This, indeed, at the time it was written, was significant of a change of attitude towards war; but it was also significant that the sole means suggested by the writer for making wars less frequent was that they should not be waged save for 'real motives' or in case of absolute necessity. Whatever it may have been to philosophers and men of religion, to men of affairs and international lawyers alike peace—to quote Sir Thomas Barclay—'until quite recently was merely the 'political condition which prevailed in the intervals between 'wars.' It was a merely negative condition; whereas now 'peace among nations has become, or is fast becoming, a 'positive subject of international regulation, while war is

'coming, among progressive peoples, to be regarded as an 'accidental disturbance of that harmony and concord among 'mankind which nations require for the fostering of their 'domestic welfare.' Peace, that is to say, is at last all but universally recognised as the natural condition of the body politic, and war as its 'violent and convulsive sickness'; and as the present generation has organised its forces to combat disease, so it is organising its forces to combat war.

After all, though it be true that war, that is to say force, is the ultimate sanction of the civil as of the natural order, it is equally true that the history of civilisation is that of the more or less successful efforts of men to associate together for the purpose of avoiding the necessity of an immediate appeal to this sanction. States and confederations of States are such associations. There is nothing in itself absurd in the dream that sooner or later, with the growing realisation of the common interests which bind the civilised world together, these associations may combine in a single association embracing all the world, its purpose to keep the peace in the interests of all. It is absurd, however, to imagine, as the extreme pacificists seem to do, that this dream is, in the actual circumstances of the world, capable of rapid realisation. The more weighty of the leaders of the peace movement, of whom M. Léon Bourgeois may be taken as the type, share no such illusion. They realised from the first what patience and labour were necessary if the foundations of an international system were to be securely laid; and in the outcome of the Conferences at the Hague in 1899 and 1907 they had their reward. To idealists of the type of M. Charles Richet this outcome of the proceedings of the world's parliament, the first meeting of which had filled them with such exaggerated hopes, was a bitter disillusionment. What is the use of arbitration treaties, he asks, which exclude all questions affecting the 'vital interests,' or the 'independence and honour' of the contracting parties, or 'the interest of third Powers'? What is this but to say that the contracting Powers will go to arbitration if they see fit, which they could have done without any treaty at all? 'Let us strip off the mask!' he exclaims. 'When one is afraid of a tribunal, it is because one is meditat-'ing a crime.' To this view a certain force has been given by the action of Italy in Tripoli, and by the reluctance of the Powers to offer their mediation under the terms of the Hague Convention. It is none the less exaggerated. More just is the view expressed by M. Bourgeois in his preface to M. Lémonon's work:

'Its object,' he says, 'was not the establishment of perpetual peace, but to set up a network of universal conventions between States as a first tie between civilised nations, to create and organise institutions of public international law, to diminish the risks and the evils of war, and to maintain between the various Powers continuity of juridical relations.'

And though, he adds, the principles accepted unanimously by the Conference were embodied only in 'declarations' and 'vœux,' these represent a moral force which will in time impose them on the Governments.

It is the growth of this moral force, which has borne fruit in a long series of international arbitration treaties, that Sir Thomas Barclay also recognises as one of the supreme gains resulting from the meetings at the Hague. Nearly a century earlier Kant, in his 'Zum ewigen Frieden,' had seen the main hope of perpetual peace in the developement of the moral idea as opposed to mere political acuteness (*Staatsklugheit*). A people, he argued, can evolve a capacity for being open to the influence of the mere idea of the authority of the law, as though this in itself possessed physical power, and this capacity might be extended to international as well as internal relations. This idea Sir Thomas Barclay developes. The old objection to International Law, he argues, that it is not law at all—since a law is 'a rule enforceable in the Courts'—is now done away with, since the decisions of the Hague tribunal, which applies its rules, have behind them the powerful sanction of public opinion.* Whether this sanction will in every case prove strong enough may be open to argument. There can be no doubt however that its strength will increase in proportion with the growth of public opinion in favour of peace. Mr. Norman Angell holds that this growth can best be furthered by an appeal to enlightened self-interest, and in 'The Great Illusion' has demonstrated the economic absurdity of war under modern conditions. Mr. Grane's recent work is a protest against this attempt to shift the discussion on to the plane of policy as insufficient to curb men's fighting instinct, and an elaboration of the theme that 'civilisation will finally 'exchange the cult of blood and iron for that of national 'fraternity only through the growing prevalence of moral 'forces.' There is, indeed, room enough for both appeals. It matters not by what process men's minds are attuned to peace, so they be attuned. To desire peace however is one thing, to

* Compare Pollock, 'Cambridge Mod. Hist.' xii. p. 712 seq.

establish it quite another; and if what has already been gained is not to be lost, it is important that public opinion should not only be led by promises of a visionary good, but realise all the obstacles to be overcome before it is attained; otherwise, like King Arthur's Knights of the Round Table, it may follow 'wandering fires' only in the end to weary of the quest.

As might be expected, it is in America, where the true conditions of international relations are but dimly appreciated, that the peace movement takes its most extreme form. Nor is the movement one to be despised. It has the patronage of men of vast wealth; its headquarters at Boston are the centre of a widespread propaganda; it aims at becoming, if it has not already become, a powerfully organised political force. It is not without interest, then, to know what is 'the practical 'programme for world organisation' which it favours. In a 'Primer of the Peace Movement,'* issued under the aegis of the American Peace Society, the following is the part of the programme 'yet to be achieved':

1. The establishment of a general arbitration treaty between all nations, pledging reference of all disputes to the World Court, as a few nations have already done.

2. The establishment of a Stated World Congress, at first only advisory, but gradually increasing its powers and evolving a code of international law.

3. Gradual proportional disarmament, following the lead already taken by Chile and Argentina.

4. A small international police force. This may not do away with the use of militia or with the possibility of civil war for an indefinite period; but it will end in a comparatively short time our barbarous international duels, by providing an effective substitute.

This may be taken as a clear statement of the practical proposals of the extremer peace advocates; and not in the United States only, for all or most of them are found scattered in the speeches or writings of this school all over the world. 'Let all the States,' writes M. Nobel to the Baroness von Suttner on the 7th of January 1893, 'undertake solidly to 'turn against the first aggressor. Then wars would become 'impossible, and even the most quarrelsome State would be 'forced to appeal to a tribunal or to keep quiet. If the Triple 'Alliance, instead of comprising three States, were to include

* 'A Primer of the Peace Movement,' by Lucia Ames Mead. (Boston. American Peace Society, 1909.)

'all States, the peace of the centuries would be assured.'* The sanction indeed is not always to be the united armed force of the Powers. M. Richet, for instance, in his utter detestation of war as 'organised murder,' thinks that the sanction of an instructed public opinion will be enough to compel the nations to submit even their vital interest to the arbitral judgement of the World's Court, and to abide by its decision. But M. Richet, in this and in other respects, falls short of the extreme pacificist position. To those who are aiming at realising their ideal of perpetual peace within a measurable time 'it is clear,' to quote Baroness von Suttner, 'how necessary and beneficial would be a European legal 'system (*Rechtszustand*), a European tribunal, and a European 'army.'

The danger of these proposals lies not only in their sentimental appeal, but in their logical completeness, which is very attractive to a certain type of mind. But while they appeal to those who like to build theories for an imaginary world, they tend to alienate from the true peace movement many whose common sense and whose patriotism are revolted by what they consider absurd and dangerous extremes. It is then, important, in the interests of the peace movement itself, to take these proposals seriously, however hard it may be to do so, and to test them, not on their own plane of abstract reasoning, but in the light of that recorded experience which we call history, so far as this may be applicable ; and to this object the remainder of this article will be devoted. We may admit at once that a discriminating judgement is necessary in applying the lessons of history to practical politics. Yet at times 'history 'repeats itself,' and it so happens that the present peace propaganda, culminating in the Hague Conferences, is in all its essential features such a repetition. To students of European diplomatic history during the seven years between the Congress of Vienna in 1815 and that of Verona in 1822 the phrases 'general treaty,' 'universal union' and 'international police' will be perfectly familiar. Our modern pacificists have heard of the Holy Alliance. They could not indeed avoid doing so ; for, in opening the first Hague Conference, its president, M. de Beaufort, spoke of the wish of the Emperor Nicholas II., its august originator, 'to realise the desire expressed by one of 'his most illustrious predecessors—the Emperor Alexander I.— 'that of seeing all the sovereigns and all the nations of Europe 'united for the purpose of living as brethren, aiding each other

* Suttner, 'Memoiren,' p. 272.

'to their reciprocal needs.' They have heard then of the Holy Alliance; but either they know nothing about it, or they prefer to dismiss it as a mere 'league of autocrats for the 'suppression of liberty,' which has no relation to the present issues involved in the organisation of peace. We do not share this view; and propose therefore briefly to sketch the growth of the idea of perpetual peace in Europe, the genesis of the Holy Alliance, which was an outcome of this idea, and to examine in somewhat more detail the working of that practical experiment in a Confederation of Europe, with which the name of the Holy Alliance is usually associated.

In a pamphlet issued under the auspices of the International School of Peace at Boston,* the Hon. David J. Brewer, a judge of the United States Supreme Court, commits himself to the statement that 'all through the Eastern Hemisphere, during 'its centuries of struggle . . . the idea of humanity bound 'by any obligation of any of its members to all the rest was a 'thing unknown in practical life and almost unmentioned in 'the theories of social philosophers. In consequence, every-'thing was determined by the mere matter of might.' Providence, it seems, according to the learned judge, postponed the discovery of America in order that the virgin soil of the New World might become the nursing-ground of peace and human brotherhood. It may be so; for the ways of Providence are past finding out. But it is wholly untrue to say that, through all these long centuries, this poor Eastern Hemisphere was in this respect wholly without light. There was an institution called the Catholic Church, which, though doubtless 'ignorance 'and superstition prevailed,' held up in some sort the ideal of the brotherhood of man and of the mutual obligations not only of individuals but of nations. There was another institution called the Roman Empire, which, in however imperfect and shadowy a form, upheld till 1806 the ideal of a 'centre of 'political unity.' During the Middle Ages, it is true, the love of fighting was universal; for gentlemen who were no scholars there was, to tell truth, little else to do. But there were also vigorous peace movements from time to time. Such was the Truce of God (*Treuga Dei*), which, originating in the eleventh century in Aquitaine and Burgundy, for two centuries served somewhat to mitigate the horrors of feudal strife, till the King's peace superseded it. There were those, too, who like Gerard de Florennes, Bishop of Cambrai and Arras—

* The Mission of the United States in the Cause of Peace, Boston, 1910.

a great peace-maker himself—objected to this movement for a reason which will appeal to the more cynical critics of similar movements at the present day, namely, that such leagues of peace only lead to much perjury. Arbitration also was not unknown. Gilbert Crispin, Abbot of Westminster, tells us in his life of Herluin, founder of the Abbey of Bec, how the messengers of Duke Robert of Normandy stopped a fight between Count Gilbert of Brionne and other Norman notables and made them swear to submit the matter in dispute to the judgement of his court.* Some hundred years later, in 1177, we have the more striking case of the reference of long-standing territorial disputes between the Courts of Castile and Navarre to the arbitration of King Henry II., as the prince of greatest personal reputation and territorial influence in Europe.†

Such instances as these are, however, isolated; though they prove that, even in the age when the 'judicium belli' was still part of the ordinary procedure of the civil courts, the idea of the peaceful settlement, by the judicial decision of a third party, of disputes between equal powers was not unknown. It was not, however, until the sixteenth century that the law of nature ('jus naturae'), which the medieval jurists had gathered from the Roman law, began to be studied in its relations to the rules of peace and war; it was not till 1625 that Grotius laid the foundations of modern International Law.

Before the appearance of the 'De jure belli et pacis' of Grotius there was imagined the first of that series of projects of peace which represents, as it were, the ancestral tree of the Holy Alliance. This is the 'grand design' of a great Christian Republic, embracing all the States of Europe, which in his 'Memoirs' Sully ascribes to Henry IV. of France, or rather, in the first instance, to Queen Elizabeth of England.‡ The language in which Sully commends this scheme curiously anticipates that of the rescript of the Emperor Nicholas II. which led to the assembly of the first Hague Conference.

'He found the secret,' he writes:

'to persuade all his neighbours that his only object was to spare himself and them these immense sums which it costs them to maintain so many thousands of fighting men, so many fortified

* 'Ut . . . judicium belli curiae suae expectent definitioni.' This seems clearly to refer to a judicial decision, not to an appeal to the usual trial by combat. (See 'Vita Domni Herluini Abbatis Beccensis,' edited by Dean Armitage Robinson, 1911, p. 88.)

† See Sir James Ramsay, 'The Angevin Empire,' p. 197.

‡ Sully's 'Memoirs' (ed. 1814), vol. v. p. 279 seq.

places, and other military expenses; to deliver them for ever from the fear of bloody catastrophes, so common in Europe; to secure for them an unalterable repose, so that all princes might henceforth live together as brothers.'

Henry's (or was it Sully's own?) Grand Design seems to have inspired Emeric Crucé to write his 'Le nouveau Cynée,' published at Paris in 1623. This substituted for the 'perpetual senate' of delegates, empowered to examine into and settle all the civil, political and religious disputes of Europe, which had been proposed in the Grand Design, an assembly of the princes themselves. So notable a company, argues Crucé, would know how to bring to reason anyone who should contest their decisions. Of more permanent influence, however, was the 'Projet de traité pour rendre la paix perpetuelle,' published by the Abbé de St. Pierre in 1713. This project, which was also inspired by the Grand Design, proposed to organise Europe on the model of the 'Germanic body' ('Corps germanique'), which was 'powerless for conquest, 'but strong for defence.' The treaty of Westphalia, the Abbé argued, was the basis of the European system, and German public law, therefore, in a sense, that of all Europe. Perpetual peace, then, could be secured by extending its principles and forming a Confederation so general that no Power, however considerable, could refuse to join it. This association was to have a judicial tribunal authorised to establish laws and rules binding on all its members and to possess 'a coactive 'and coercive force' strong enough to compel every State to submit to the general will.

The Abbé's project, as might have been expected, had a very mixed reception. By some, as by Leibnitz,* it was commended; by the majority it was derided as the dream of a visionary. Cardinal Fleury, when it was shown to him, remarked that it was admirable, save for one omission: there was no provision for sending missionaries to convert the hearts of princes. It was, indeed, largely the Abbé's trust in princes

* It is interesting to note that Leibnitz, while approving the Abbé's scheme in general, regretted that it ignored the traditional authority of the Roman Empire, 'which has lasted for so many centuries.' 'Jurisconsults know,' he says, 'that one does not lose one's rights, nor even their possession, because there has been no occasion to exercise them; and that it is not necessary even to insist on them, save where those who owe these rights, declare that they wish to repudiate their obligation.' 'Observations sur le projet de paix etc.,' Œuvres, t. 4, p. 328 (Paris, 1832).

that exposed his project later to the scornful criticism of Rousseau and his disciples, who saw the hope of perpetual peace in the triumph of equality and the rights of man. Yet it was ultimately an autocratic sovereign who first attempted to give the Abbé's project of perpetual peace a practical application, and this, by a singular irony of fate, for the purpose of putting a stop to the desolating series of wars due to the armed propaganda of Rousseau's political gospel by the new-born French democracy. It is probable that the Emperor Alexander of Russia was first made acquainted with the Abbé de St. Pierre's project through his tutor César de La Harpe, a disciple of Rousseau who was destined to play some part in the Revolution and was largely responsible for the Tsar's 'Jacobinism.'* However this may be, it was certainly the Abbé's idea which inspired the remarkable proposals contained in a letter addressed by Alexander on the 11th of July 1804 to his friend Novossiltsov, the Russian ambassador in London, who was to lay them before Pitt. According to these, the outcome of the war then being waged by the Coalition against Napoleon was to be not merely the 'liberation of France' but the universal triumph of the 'rights of humanity.' For this purpose it would be necessary, 'after having attached the nations to their Governments by 'making these incapable of acting save in the greatest interests 'of their subjects, to fix the relations of the States among 'each other on more precise rules, such as it is to their interest 'to respect.' There should be a 'general treaty,' to form the basis of the relations of the States forming the 'European 'Confederation.'

'Why could one not submit to it,' the Tsar enquired, 'the positive rights of nations, assure the privilege of neutrality, insert the obligation of never beginning war until all the resources which the mediation of a third party could offer have been exhausted, until the grievances have by this means been brought to light, and an effort to remove them has been made? On principles such as these one could proceed to a general pacification and give birth to a League of which the stipulations would form, so to speak, a new code of the law of nations, while those who should try to infringe it would risk bringing upon themselves the forces of the new Union.'†

This document is mainly interesting as showing how early

* Rousseau said that the project was absurd 'without a Henri IV. or a Sully to carry it out.' This may have fired Alexander's imagination to attempt the task.

† This letter, which is quoted by Mr. Phillips, is given in full in Tatischev, 'Alexandre I. et Napoléon,' 1801–1812.

the Emperor Alexander began to dream those dreams which eleven years later he attempted to translate into reality. The proposal, of course, was still-born. Alexander himself, indeed, was not yet really 'converted'; and it only needed the personal fascination of Napoleon, exerted during the famous interview at Tilsit in 1807, to make the impressionable autocrat forget his vision of a federated Europe and join Napoleon in another grand design: that of dividing between them the empire of the world. Soon, however, the process of conversion was begun—in the inevitable disillusionment that comes to those who make compacts with the devil (and Napoleon became for Alexander 'the demon of Revolution'), the growing estrangement of the new allies, and the open breach which led to the horrors of the Russian campaign of 1812. It was at the burning of Moscow, as Alexander afterwards confessed to Bishop Eylert, that his own soul had found illumination and that he had accepted the divine mission of becoming the peacemaker of the world.*

The events of the next two years tended to confirm Alexander in the belief that he was the chosen instrument of Providence for this purpose. Up to and including the Congress of Vienna there was indeed little evidence that the Russian autocrat was inclined to translate his new evangelical principles into practice. In the conferences that preceded the Congress, and in the Congress itself, the principles that prevailed were those of the old diplomacy. During the negotiations at Châtillon in 1814 Napoleon might have saved his throne had he consented to the reduction of France within the limits demanded by the principle of the balance of power. His refusal to accept this principle led to the reconstruction of the Coalition against him by the Treaty of Chaumont, the main importance of which, in relation to the later developements of the European Concert, lay in the fact that it was an agreement of the four Great Powers—Austria, Great Britain, Prussia and Russia—to act together for certain specific purposes, namely, the overthrow of Napoleon and his family and the reduction of France within her 'natural' boundaries.' The accomplishment of these objects was to be followed by the convocation of a general Congress for the purpose of reconstructing the European polity.

The Congress of Vienna, which met in the autumn of 1814, was notable as the first solemn meeting of the rulers of the civilised world for a great common, pacific purpose. How

* Eylert, 'Charakterzüge des Königs Friedrich Wilhelm III.' ii. pp. 246–248.

greatly its outcome fell short of the expectations raised by its assembly was, however, pointed out by Friedrich von Gentz in an appreciation of its work written after the signature of the Final Act on the 9th of June 1815.

'Men had promised themselves,' he says, 'an all-embracing reform of the political system of Europe: in one word, the return of the Golden Age. The Congress has resulted in nothing but partial restorations, which had already been effected by arms; agreements between the Great Powers, of little value for the future balance and preservation of the peace of Europe; quite arbitrary alterations in the possessions of the less important States; but in no act of a higher nature, no great measure for public order or for the universal good, which might compensate humanity for its long sufferings, or reassure it as to the future.'

Yet, as Gentz goes on to say, 'something had been done.' This 'something' was the arrangement of a series of treaties which for many years represented, as it were, the common law of Europe and, though not placed under the collective guarantee of the Powers, formed a convenient basis for the action of the European Concert on any questions that might arise. It was a long step, in idea at least, from the old international anarchy of the eighteenth century. Europe as a political conception had come into existence.

The question now arose as to the international organisation which, it was generally recognised, would be necessary, for a time at least, in order to preserve peace on the basis of the treaties. What was to be its character and what the limits of its jurisdiction? Hitherto everything had in effect been settled by a concert of the four Great Powers who had signed the Treaty of Chaumont. Even at Vienna, though all the States of Europe were represented, everything of importance was settled in a close committee of the Great Powers. To this, owing to the skilful diplomacy of Talleyrand, France had with some difficulty also been admitted; but the return of Napoleon from Elba once more excluded her from the Concert, and on the 25th of March 1815 the four Powers of the Grand Alliance signed at Vienna what was virtually a renewal of the Treaty of Chaumont. The Concert, that is to say, after as before the Congress, was limited alike in its constitution and in its objects; it did not include all the sovereign States of Europe, and its aim was confined once more to reducing France to order.

At this point a new factor was introduced. The battle of Waterloo had been fought, and the allied sovereigns were advancing on Paris, when one of the strangest events in all

history occurred : the ' conversion ' of the Emperor Alexander by the Baroness von Krüdener. It may be permissible here to digress from the main argument a while in order, with the assistance of M. Muhlenbeck's fascinating little book, to gain some idea of the atmosphere of the age which made this event possible. It was—as indeed might have been expected after so many convulsions—an age when men's nerves were unstrung, and a little thing could upset them altogether. Most usually this derangement took the form of religious extravagances. Napoleon was evidently Antichrist and the latter days were about to be accomplished. Under the influence of the pietistic reaction the belief was widely spread that a man would be raised up ' from the north . . . from the rising of the sun ' (Isa. xli. 25), that Antichrist would be overthrown, and that Christ would come to establish the millennium upon earth. Of this belief Madame de Krüdener, the widow of a Russian ambassador, who had been ' converted ' from a life of pleasure some eight years before, had constituted herself an apostle. Her rank gave her the *entrée* into exalted circles, including the pietistic Court of Baden at Karlsruhe, which was closely related to that of Russia. From this quarter efforts, hitherto vain, had been made to bring the Baroness into touch with the Emperor Alexander, whose conscience, haunted by the spectre of his murdered father, had vainly sought peace elsewhere.

In the spring of 1815 it happened that the Baroness was settled at Schlüchtern, a piece of Baden territory *enclavé* in Würtemberg, busy persuading the unhappy peasants to sell all and fly from the wrath to come. Near this, at Heilbronn, the Emperor Alexander fixed his headquarters on the night of the 4th of June ; and that very night the Baroness sought and obtained an interview. To the Tsar, who had been brooding alone over an open Bible, her sudden arrival seemed an answer to his prayers ; and for three hours the prophetess preached her strange gospel, while the most powerful man in Europe sat, his face buried in his hands, sobbing like a child ; until at last he declared that he had ' found peace.' Next day the Baroness, with her disciple the evangelist Empeytaz, joined the Russian headquarters, which she accompanied to Heidelberg and later to Paris, where she was lodged in the Hôtel Montchenu, next door to the Elysée Palace occupied by the Emperor. A private door connected the houses, and every evening the autocrat went to take part in the prayer-meetings conducted by the Baroness and Empeytaz.

In this religious forcing-house there germinated and grew

to rapid maturity the idea of the Holy Alliance. The treaty, or rather the manifesto, in which this idea was embodied was signed in the first instance only by the sovereigns of Russia, Austria and Prussia, and was first proclaimed by the Emperor Alexander at a review of the allied troops held on the Champ des Vertus near Paris on the 26th of September 1815. In its terms, in spite of the sinister reputation it later obtained, there was nothing to which even the American Peace Society could object. In general it merely stated the determination of the signatory sovereigns to govern henceforward in accordance with the principles of the Gospel of Christ, and to regard each other as brothers and their subjects as their children.* It was not consciously a conspiracy against popular liberty; indeed Alexander himself, who in the letter to Novossiltsov above quoted had spoken of the necessity of 'attaching the nations to 'their Governments,' was soon, to the distraction of Metternich, insisting that the grant of liberal constitutions by the princes was the logical outcome of its principles.† Its political significance, in fact, did not lie on the surface, and of the sovereigns who signed it probably not one took it seriously, except Alexander himself, who sincerely believed that it would 'give a 'lofty satisfaction to Divine Providence.' From one point of view however, and that very germane to our present argument, it had great significance. In contradistinction to the treaties on which the Grand Alliance was based, it had been signed by all the sovereigns of Europe with the exception of the Prince Regent of Great Britain, the Pope, and the Sultan. It represented, that is to say, a revival by the Emperor Alexander of that idea of a 'universal union' or 'confederation of Europe' which he had propounded in 1804.

In some ways the times were propitious for such an experiment: for a generation wearied by a quarter of a century of perpetual war might well have been expected to welcome any system that should give a hope of establishing perpetual peace. Napoleon himself, watching events from his island prison,

---

* The full text is given in Hertslet, 'Map of Europe by Treaty,' No. 36; and in the Encyclopædia Britannica, 11th ed., s. v. 'Holy Alliance.'

† In a letter to Castlereagh of 21st of March 1816, given by Martens in his 'Recueil des traités conclus par la Russie,' Alexander uses the following remarkable language: 'There are countries where the attempt is now being obstinately made to revive institutions which have perished of old age. The new spirit of the peoples is too little consulted,' etc. etc.

declared—according to Las Cases—that his own ultimate aim had been to establish under the aegis of his Empire a confederation 'bound together by unity of codes, principles, 'feelings and interests,' and prophesied that the dream could yet be realised by the force of circumstances. But such a 'universal union,' if it were to be made effective, would need what the Napoleonic idea provided: a central executive, a central legislative authority, and a common armament to enforce its decrees. Even in matters of purely external policy this would be to endanger the sovereign independence of the nations; and if, as was inevitable, it should become difficult to draw a sharp dividing line between external affairs and internal affairs having an external effect, what would become of national liberties? Great Britain at least, which had strained her resources to the uttermost in the successful effort to save the principle of national independence by destroying the Napoleonic system, was not likely to consent to see it replaced by one equally obnoxious and probably far less effective. Castlereagh, who was in charge of the negotiations in Paris, though a firm supporter of the Grand Alliance, realised from the first the danger involved in any such collective interference in the supposed general interest with the liberties of the nations.

The difference of opinion in this matter was apparent in the councils of the Allies even during the negotiations which preceded the signature of the second Peace of Paris. In addition to the treaty with France it had been decided to renew simultaneously the treaty of alliance concluded at Chaumont and renewed at Vienna, with such modifications as had become necessary owing to the restoration of the legitimate dynasty in France. It was as to the character of these modifications that differences arose. The original draft of the treaty was drawn up by the Emperor Alexander, and asserted in every line the right of united Europe to watch over the internal affairs of France, provision being made for armed intervention 'in case of revolutionary madness,' etc. The fourth article provided that the Powers would renew among themselves, after the expiration of the temporary occupation of France, the treaties of reciprocal guarantee of their respective possessions as well as for the general peace and repose. The sixth article, which appeared in a significantly modified form in the actual treaty, ran as follows:

'In order to facilitate the execution of the present treaty, and in order to give the necessary effect to the system of reciprocal guarantees, the High Contracting Powers have agreed to renew at

fixed periods, either under their own immediate auspices or by their respective ministers, conferences of which the results shall afford constant proofs of the permanence and intimacy of their union.' *

This draft was subjected by Castlereagh to a searching criticism. He objected altogether to any attitude being taken up by the Powers towards France that was not dictated by 'the immediate security of their own dominions,' and as for the Tsar's system of mutual guarantees, he would have none of it. In the end his view prevailed, though, as finally drafted, the Treaty of Alliance of the 20th of November 1815, which was to form the basis of the European Concert, contained a provision which in its essence represented a compromise with Alexander's ideal. The sixth article, based on the sixth article of the Russian draft above quoted, but with significant alterations, ran as follows:

'In order to consolidate the intimate tie which unites the four Sovereigns for the happiness of the world, the High Contracting Powers have agreed to renew at fixed intervals, either under their own auspices or by their representative Ministers, meetings consecrated to great common objects and the examination of such measures as at each one of these epochs shall be judged most salutary for the peace and prosperity of the nations and for the maintenance of the peace of Europe.'

The mutual guarantee of possessions has disappeared; and though periodic meetings of the Allies 'consecrated to great 'common objects' are provided for, the language of the rest of the sentence, when compared with that of the sixth article of the Russian draft, suggests that these meetings were not to be considered as part of a permanent system, but were merely a convenient diplomatic expedient for facilitating the common action of the Allies on any question as it should arise. This certainly was the view held by British Ministers. But as we shall see, this was not the view held by the Emperor Alexander.

The first conference of the Allied Powers summoned under this article was that at Aix-la-Chapelle in October 1818, which calls for some notice in detail, because it represented the most consistent attempt to govern Europe by international agreement and affords a remarkable example of the difficulties presented by such an experiment. The question which was

* F. O. Records. Congress, Paris, Castlereagh. Projet de traité. Enclosed in Castlereagh to Liverpool, Paris, Oct. 15. No. 80.

the ostensible occasion of the meeting—the evacuation of France by the allied army of occupation—had in fact already been settled by diplomacy, and was disposed of in a single session. It had been decided, however, to use the auspicious occasion for the discussion of other 'great common objects': the questions of the Slave Trade; of the Barbary pirates; of the refusal of the King of Sweden (Bernadotte) to carry out the provisions of the Treaty of Kiel; of the proposed general mediation of the Powers between Spain and her revolted colonies; above all, that of the future constitution of the European Alliance and the relation to it of France.*

Clearly, at this period the Alliance was regarded, even by Great Britain, as something more than a mere union of the Great Powers for preserving peace on the basis of the *status quo*; and the Conference acted, in effect, as a sort of European House of Lords, which not only discussed objects of common interest, but heard appeals and received petitions from sovereigns and their subjects alike. The German mediatised princes invoked the aid of the Powers to secure them in their 'liberties,' and received satisfaction. Letitia Bonaparte, in a pathetic letter, petitioned for the release of her son the Emperor Napoleon on the ground that his mortal illness would prevent his ever again being a menace to Europe. The people of Monaco presented a list of grievances against their prince. The Elector of Hesse begged—in vain—to be allowed to change his meaningless title for that of King. These may serve as specimens of the variety of lesser issues on which the Powers were able to come to an agreement. It is significant, however, that on the greater issues discussed there was no such edifying harmony. The Powers had already agreed in principle to the suppression of the Slave Trade; jealousy of British sea-power prevented their accepting that 'mutual right of search' by which alone it could have been suppressed. The Barbary pirates were the scourge of the whole continental sea-board; it was found impossible to concert measures against them because of British jealousy of Russian intervention in the Mediterranean. The struggle between Spain and her colonies was regarded as a serious menace to the peace of Europe; the Powers were agreed as to the principle of mediation, but could not agree as to its form. They did agree in calling the King of Sweden to order. He obeyed, but at the same time protested against the 'dictatorship' arrogated to themselves by

* Those are the questions defined in two Cabinet memoranda of the 4th of September.

the Great Powers, a protest reinforced by an indignant letter from the King of Würtemberg.

These protests had their weight in the discussions at Aix, where the whole question of the 'to be or not to be' of a permanent 'Confederation of Europe' was raised. At the outset all were agreed on two points: that the continued 'revolutionary' unrest in France made it necessary to maintain the Quadruple Alliance, and that, in the interests of the peace of Europe, a wider Alliance must be established, into which France must be admitted. With the renewal of the Treaty of Chaumont we are not here concerned. The discussion at Aix of the question of the wider Alliance has, however, in view of the present tentative efforts towards an international system, an interest which is more than merely historical.

The question was what form this wider Alliance, on the principle of which all were agreed, should take. To the Emperor Alexander the answer seemed clear. All that was necessary was to expand the Quadruple Alliance till it should fill the limits laid down by the Holy Alliance—cease, that is to say, to be a limited Concert for certain defined purposes, and become a 'universal union' for all common purposes. This scheme was elaborated in a 'Confidential Memoran-'dum of the Russian Cabinet,' dated 26th of September (8th of October) 1818. In considering the measures necessary for preserving Europe from 'the return of revolutions and the 'principle that might is right' ('du droit du plus fort'), it pointed out that Europe had been restored in 1815 and preserved till then by the Alliance of the Great States, unalterable in principle, but extending its sphere according to circumstances, and thus becoming the Alliance of all the States. The woes suffered by humanity had been due to egoism and to partial and exclusive combinations in politics, the proof of which lay in the good derived during the last few years from the empire of Christian morality and the rights of man. If Europe had enjoyed peace it was because her system—'the 'work of Providence, not of any Cabinet'—was a general association, having for foundation the 'recess' of Vienna and the treaty of Paris, for conservative principle the fraternal union of the Allied Powers, for aim the guarantee of all recognised rights. The needs of the age demanded the strengthening of the moral force which was to be found 'only in the elements constituting the actual European system 'and in a combination which in the eyes of all the world will 'make the cohesion of this system evident, necessary and 'indissoluble.' These elements were the Quadruple Alliance,

based on the Treaty of the 8th (20th) of November 1815, and the General Alliance, which is found in the Final Act of the Congress of Vienna and 'the subsequent Acts of Paris of the year 1815.' The Emperor therefore proposed (1) that the Quadruple Alliance should be preserved, to guard against special danger from France; (2) that a General Alliance should be formed, to which all the signatory Powers of the Treaty of Vienna should be parties, its object being the guarantee of the territorial *status quo* and of 'legitimate sovereignty *ab antiquo*.'*

This remarkable document, though drafted by Pozzo di Borgo, was inspired in every line by Alexander himself. It has been usual to sneer at the hypocrisy of the author of the Holy Alliance and to judge of his sincerity not by his earlier professions, but by his later attitude when the diplomacy of Metternich, taking advantage of his weariness and disillusionment, had persuaded him to lend himself to the conversion of what he had conceived as a guarantee of peace into an instrument of reaction. British statesmen at Aix gathered no such impression of the Emperor's insincerity. In a letter to Lord Bathurst Castlereagh speaks of the 'cordiality and earnest-'ness' of Alexander 'together with an exaltation of mind 'which,' he adds, 'perhaps hurried him into touching upon 'measures beyond the point to which, I trust, his ultimate 'views may be brought to subside.'† The Emperor, indeed, two years previously, after suggesting a general disarmament, had taken no notice of Castlereagh's caustic suggestion that in this respect, Austria and Prussia having already begun to disarm, he himself should set 'a salutary example to Europe.'‡ But at Aix, in all sincerity, he tried to disarm the natural scepticism this attitude had aroused. 'I have,' he said to Castlereagh,

'as much territory as I can desire and more than I can well manage. I consider my army as the army of Europe, and as such alone it will be employed. I will not admit that it can be otherwise employed, than with Europe, to repress any attempt that may be made to shake the system of which my Empire forms only a part.'§

---

* A copy of this memorandum, which is partly quoted by Mr. Alison Phillips, is enclosed in a despatch of Castlereagh. F.O. Records. Continent. Aix. Castlereagh. No. 13.

† F.O. Cont. Aix-la-Chapelle. Castlereagh. To Bathurst. Oct. 3, 1818. No. 4.

‡ See Martens, 'Recueil des traités conclus par la Russie,' etc vol. xi. p. 261.

§ F.O. loc. cit. To Bathurst. Oct. 3, 1818. No. 2.

As to the method by which this force was to be made available for European purposes, 'both the Emperor and his Minister 'Count Capo d'Istria,' wrote Castlereagh (to Bathurst, on the 19th of October),

'were, in conversation, disposed to push their ideas very far indeed, in the sense of all the Powers of Europe being bound together in a common league, guaranteeing to each other the existing order of things, in thrones as well as in territories, all being bound to march, if requisite, against the first Power that offended, either by her ambition or by her revolutionary transgressions.'

It is not surprising that to British Ministers the vision of perpetual peace should seem too dearly bought at the price of the subjugation of Europe to an international police of which the undiminished legions of Russia were to form a constituent element. As Castlereagh wrote later (9th of November), when the proposal for a 'universal guarantee' had re-emerged in another form, 'it was opening up to such a Power as 'Russia . . . an almost irresistible claim to march through 'the territories of all the Confederate States to the most distant 'points of Europe to fulfil her guarantee,' a claim, it may be added, which Alexander actually did make in connexion with the revolutionary troubles in Spain in 1820.

From the point of view of British Ministers the position was one of singular delicacy. They rightly held that, under the actual conditions of Europe, the maintenance of the Alliance was essential; they had committed themselves by Article 6 of the Treaty of the 20th of November 1815 to the principle of holding 'at fixed intervals' meetings 'consecrated to great 'common objects'; they had even allowed the Prince Regent to express his pious assent to the lofty doctrine of the Holy Alliance; they were vividly conscious of the necessity for 'calming the alarm of the other Powers,' to which the Kings of Sweden and Würtemberg had given vigorous expression. The Emperor Alexander, then, might well persuade himself that he was but asking them to carry to their logical conclusion principles to which they were already committed. The formation of a Universal Union, as foreshadowed by the Holy Alliance, would at once give to the periodic meetings greater weight, and disarm all opposition by giving to all States, great and small, a share in them; peace, the object of the Quadruple Alliance, would be secured by making it impossible for any Power to break it, since any attempt to do so would bring down upon it the armed forces of all the rest. Castlereagh, however, was less impressed by the excellence of Alexander's logic than

by the danger of applying its conclusions. A limited Alliance, for certain defined purposes, was one thing ; a universal union, committed to common action under circumstances that could not be foreseen, was quite another. The admission into the councils of Europe of a number of small States would, moreover, open the door to intrigues the perils of which were minimised in the narrower Alliance. The difficulty of duly distributing the weight of the constituent members of such an assembly* had been well illustrated by the constitution of the German Federal Diet, in which the disproportionately small voting power given to Austria and Prussia had already led to a rivalry between them to gain the rest. So far from such a league leading to disarmament, the decisive voice in it would be that of the master of the biggest battalions. It was feared, in short, that the Emperor Alexander was disguising—even from himself —' under the language of evangelical abnegation ' the ambition of playing in the new Confederation of Europe the part which Austria had already begun to play in the German Confederation. A league formed for the preservation of peace might thus develope into the domination of one or more of the Great Powers over the rest — in short, into that very tyranny, destructive of the liberties of the nations, against which, in the person of Napoleon, Great Britain had so long struggled.

Castlereagh's diplomacy in resisting Alexander's project was helped by the attitude of the British Parliament, in which there was a growing opposition to the supposed subservience of Great Britain to ' a league of foreign despots,' though this attitude produced an added complication. It helped him because, desiring as he did to preserve the cordiality of the Alliance on the old lines, it enabled him to disarm the resentment of the Tsar at his *non possumus* attitude by throwing the onus of it on Parliament, to which he was ultimately responsible. It produced a complication, because he had not only to humour the Allies but also Parliament, which in its actual temper a little thing might have led to force an open breach with the Alliance in any form.

---

* This difficulty was well illustrated during the discussions at the second Hague Conference. The American proposal to establish a permanent Arbitral Court consisting of paid judges, for instance, broke down owing to the opposition of Señor Ruy Barboza, in the name of the South American States, to the obviously necessary plan of making the composition of this Court bear some proportion to the importance of the States represented.

The anxiety of the Cabinet in this respect is reflected in a letter of Bathurst to Castlereagh, in which, among much else, he deprecates any succession of meetings under Article 6 'being 'now proclaimed as part of a permanent system.' This anxiety was speedily allayed. In his reply to Bathurst's letter, dated the 5th of November, Castlereagh was able to announce that every point mentioned in it had already been agreed to by the Powers. For the time being Alexander's 'Universal Union' was shelved, and in its place was a new Concert of the Allies with France, 'a Concert confined within the limits of the most 'restricted interpretation which can be given to Article 6 of the 'Treaty of November 1815, i.e. confined to the maintenance 'of the peace as established by the treaties therein enumer-'ated.' As to 'eventual reunions,' these were 'strictly limited 'to those interests that grow out of the transactions in ques-'tion; they were not to be held at fixed periods, but were to 'arise out of the occasion and be agreed upon by the Five Courts 'at the time,' no Power being, in fact, pledged *a priori* to any meeting whatever.

It is impossible to read the records of the transactions at Aix without being impressed by the mastery of the diplomatic art shown by Castlereagh in obtaining this result. He had to deal not only with the impracticable idealism of Alexander, but also with the very 'real' attitude of Prussia and Austria, both of which Powers supported the idea of the 'universal 'guarantee' for practical purposes of their own; Prussia, because she trembled for the safety of her newly acquired Rhine provinces; Austria, because Metternich saw in the Tsar's pacificist enthusiasm the surest influence for keeping his erratic ambitions within bounds, and in the materialisation of the Holy Alliance an effective means for establishing that system of 'stability' in Europe which he held to be necessary to the safety of the 'rotten structure' of the Habsburg Monarchy. On the other hand, the attitude of both these Powers at Aix depended on that of Alexander. If, then, the ties that bound Great Britain to the Alliance were not to be prematurely broken, it was—as Castlereagh wrote home—necessary 'to 'hold the Emperor's mind within the principles that could be 'maintained in Parliament' and for this purpose 'to present 'something that would at once be in our line, and at the same 'time present the subject somewhat in the tone of his own 'ideas.' In a series of interviews with Alexander and Capo d'Istria, he succeeded, mainly by pleading the Parliamentary situation, in forcing them 'to descend from their abstractions 'to a considerable degree and in preparing the Conference for

'some practical conclusions.' Then, the ground having been thus prepared, he sent his formal answer.

'The benign principles of the Alliance of the 26th of September 1815,' he wrote, 'may be considered as constituting the European system in the matter of political conscience. It would, however, be derogatory to this solemn act of the Sovereigns to mix its discussion with the ordinary diplomatic obligations which bind State to State, and which are to be looked for alone in the treaties which have been concluded in the accustomed form.'

As for the universal alliance for securing the peace and happiness of the world, this was a problem 'of speculation and hope' which had never been, and probably never would be, put into practice. Great Britain protested, now as ever, against the principle of intervention which it involved.

It need only be added that the protest was effective, and that the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle ended with no more than a renewal of the Quadruple Treaty and a Declaration, the signature of which last by France advertised her readmission to the Concert. The essential parts of this Declaration, which Gentz said represented 'the most serious effort to provide the trans-'parent soul of the Holy Alliance with a body,' are as follows :

'The Convention of the 9th of October, 1818, which definitively regulated the execution of the engagements agreed to in the Treaty of Peace of the 20th of November 1815, is considered by the Sovereigns who concurred therein as the accomplishment of the work of Peace, and as the completion of the political System destined to ensure its solidity.

'The intimate Union established among the Monarchs . . . offers to Europe the most sacred pledge of its future tranquillity. . . . It does not tend to any new political combination—to any change in the Relations sanctioned by existing Treaties ; . . . it has no other object than the maintenance of Peace and the guarantee of those transactions on which the Peace was founded and consolidated.

'The Sovereigns in forming this august Union, have regarded as its fundamental basis their invariable resolution never to depart, either among themselves, or in their relations with other States, from the strictest observation of the principles of the Right of Nations : principles, which, in their application to a state of permanent Peace, can alone effectually guarantee the Independence of each Government, and the stability of the general association.

'Faithful to these principles, the Sovereigns will maintain them equally in those meetings at which they may be personally present, or in those which shall take place among their Ministers ; whether they be for the purpose of discussing in common their own interests, or whether they shall relate to questions in which other Governments

shall formally claim their interference. The same spirit which will direct their councils, and reign in their diplomatic communications, will preside also at these meetings ; and the repose of the world will be constantly their motive and their end.' *

An analysis of the language of this Declaration shows that it was a compromise. It was intended to conciliate Alexander by ' presenting the subject somewhat in the tone of his own ' ideas,' while making it clear that the foundation of the European ' system ' was the treaties and the treaties alone. It was not, however, so unambiguous as to deprive Alexander of all chance of again bringing forward his grand design, and the growing unrest in regenerated Europe was soon to give him an excuse for doing so. During 1819 the Liberal revival in France was seriously exercising the minds of the Allies, and Alexander proposed the revival of the international conference of Ministers at Paris for the purpose of watching over French affairs. The proposal broke down on the opposition of Great Britain and Austria. ' They (the Allies) must be conscious,' wrote Castlereagh to his brother Lord Stewart, ambassador in Vienna, ' that their union can never be more imposing, never more ' commanding, perhaps never so effectual in its grand and ' salutary purpose, as when it operates by the silent force of ' its inactivity.' It should, in short, ' view France in its external ' aspects not in its internal eccentricities.'† Metternich, too, was equally convinced that any appearance of intervention would only ' drive the evil forward.'‡ The latter, indeed, at this time was convinced that Alexander's plan was directed mainly against Austria, the proof being the ' revolutionary ' agitation carried on by Russian agents in Italy and the Tsar's opposition, under Capo d'Istria's influence, to the repressive policy in Germany which culminated in the Carlsbad Decrees.

The suspicion was increased in the following year, when Alexander offered to march 150,000 ' European police ' of Russian nationality through Austrian territory to the south of France, to overawe the revolutionists of France and Spain alike. The language by which this offer was accompanied proclaimed once more the Tsar's devotion to the idea of the universal union. In the British attitude he could see nothing but ' all the egoism

* Hertslet, ' Map of Europe by Treaty,' No. 88. The French version is in ' State Papers,' vol. vi.

† F.O. Drafts to Lord Stewart. May–Dec. 1819. Mem. of Sept. on the Russian proposal of intervention in France.

‡ F.O. Austria. Gordon. Jan.–Dec. 1819. Gordon to Castlereagh. Rome. April 22.

'of an exclusive policy.' He saw, or pretended to see, in the Declaration of Aix-la-Chapelle proof that the monarchs who signed it regarded themselves as 'united by the bonds of 'general fraternity to all the Powers which signed the Treaty 'of Vienna, and he regretted that individual views some-'times caused a divergence in the course which the allied 'Courts were, so to speak, forced to follow when it became a 'question of putting into practice the theory of the universal 'union.'* 'I know neither a Quadruple nor a Quintuple 'Alliance,' said Capo d'Istria to Lebzeltern, the Austrian ambassador; 'I only know the Declaration of Aix-la-'Chapelle. . . . We see a general association of all the Powers 'based on the principles of public law.' If Great Britain chose to remain outside it, Hanover at least could be included.†

A principle which Metternich agreed with Great Britain in rejecting when its immediate application conflicted violently with Austrian interests wore quite another aspect to him when, as we have seen was the case at Aix-la-Chapelle, it seemed to him to further those interests. Such a case arose with the outbreak of the military revolution at Naples. For this, and for an outline of the negotiations that led up to the assembly of the Congress of Troppau in the autumn of 1820, we must refer to the 'Cambridge Modern History.' Here it will suffice to state that the occasion seemed to Metternich a unique opportunity for committing Alexander publicly to a repudiation of the revolutionary agitation in Italy which had been largely carried on in his name; and for such a repudiation something more than lip-service to his 'sublime conception' seemed not too high a price to pay. Luckily, too, for Metternich the Tsar, whose Liberalism had suffered some rude shocks, arrived at Troppau 'a changed man.'‡ In the famous interview with Metternich on the 24th of October at Troppau he placed himself

---

* Copy of a despatch of Golowkine (15th of July 1820). In a report of Lebzeltern (St. Petersburg, $\frac{25}{17}$ July). F.O. Austria. Domestic. Sept.–Dec. 1820.

† Ibid. Report of Lebzeltern.

‡ In a letter to Esterhazy, Austrian ambassador in Paris, dated 23rd of March 1820, Metternich comments on the profound effect produced on Alexander by the murder of the Duc de Berri. F.O. Austria. Domestic. Jan.–Aug. 1820.

In another letter (8th of August) to the same, he says that Alexander on taking leave of M. de Schöler had said: 'J'ai méconnu l'esprit public depuis la chute de Bonaparte, mais les derniers événements m'ont ouvert les yeux.' F.O. Austria. Dom. Sept.–Dec. 1820.

unreservedly in his hands. 'To-day,' he said, 'I deplore all 'that I have said and done between the years 1814 and 1818.'* Clearly, with the supreme idealist in such a mood, there was from Metternich's point of view some use to be made of his ideals. A month before he had still repudiated the general principle of intervention. 'The Emperor,' he wrote to Esterhazy on the 8th of September,

'will never recognise that he has a right to interfere in the internal affairs of another State. While maintaining this principle, however, his Imperial Majesty cannot recognise in another State the right to menace, under any pretext whatever, the repose of his Empire, the peace of Europe, and the well-being of society.'†

So far, indeed, as the revolution in Naples represented a breach of treaty obligations with Austria and a menace to her interests, even Great Britain had recognised her right to intervene. But Metternich, now that Alexander was 'in his pocket,' was anxious to back this intervention with all the 'moral force' of the Alliance, and suddenly became an enthusiast for the Tsar's principles. The result was the signature, on the 19th of November 1820, of the famous Troppau Protocol, which marks a further step in the idea of the Confederation of Europe by consecrating the principle of collective intervention. The most important article runs as follows:

'States which have undergone a change of government due to revolution, the results of which threaten other States, *ipso facto* cease to be members of the European Alliance, and remain excluded from it until their situation gives guarantees for legal order and stability. If, owing to such alterations, immediate danger threatens other States, the Powers bind themselves, by peaceful means, or if need be by arms, to bring back the guilty State into the bosom of the Great Alliance.'

It was, however, significant, as it was also from Metternich's point of view unfortunate, that the Protocol bore the signatures of three only of the five Allied Powers. The motives for the abstention of France were obvious; that of Great Britain was based on a far more radical objection. Metternich had used all his incomparable diplomatic arts to win over the British Government to his views, but in vain. In a conversation with Lord Stewart and Sir Robert Gordon he attempted to minimise the implications of the Protocol. It was not intended to interfere with the internal concerns of States so far as these were purely internal; what was intended was 'something like the guarantee

* Metternich to Esterhazy. 24th of October 1820. Ibid.

† F.O. Austria. Dom. Sept.–Dec. 1820.

'of the German Confederation.' 'You mean then to establish 'a European Confederation?' he was asked. This he denied, adding that there might be an analogy between a measure of general conservation and some law of an individual State, without the sum of the laws governing this State being applied to the relations of the Powers.* All his attempts, however, to win over Castlereagh at least to a 'moral' support of the Protocol failed. In a letter to Lord Stewart of the 16th of December 1820, Castlereagh subjected the Protocol to a masterly criticism which is not without application to more recent proposals of a similar nature. 'If, as I suppose,' he wrote, 'its provisions are to be made reciprocal, will the Great 'Powers of Europe be prepared to admit the principle that 'their territories are to be thrown open to each others' approach 'upon cases of assumed necessity or expediency, of which not 'the party receiving aid, but the party administering it, is to 'be the judge?' Great Britain at least, he said, protested against this principle being, in any circumstances, applied to itself; it could be no party to a scheme which seemed 'to lead 'to the creation of a species of general government in Europe, 'with a superintending Directory, destructive of all correct 'notions of internal sovereign authority; and it could not 'charge itself, as a member of the Alliance, with the moral 'responsibility of administering a general European police 'of this description.'

It is not necessary for our present purpose to trace the further fortunes of the Emperor Alexander's 'sublime conception.' The opposition to it of Great Britain, proclaimed at Troppau, was emphasised at the Congress of Laibach in the following year, and at that of Verona in 1822 developed into an open breach with the Alliance. From the moment when Great Britain decided—to use George Canning's phrase—'to revolve 'in her own orbit,' the harmonious motion of the European constellation was made impossible, and after the revolution of 1830 it broke definitively into two opposed groups. On the one side were the two Western Liberal Powers, Great Britain and France, under whose active encouragement the forces of nationality and constitutional liberty developed, amid wars and revolutions, until the system established at Vienna had been shattered. On the other side were the three Powers who had signed the Troppau Protocol, Austria, Prussia and Russia, united in a Holy Alliance which, under the influence of

* Metternich to Esterhazy. 24th of November 1820. F.O. Austria. Domestic. Sept.–Dec. 1820.

the 'Iron Tsar' Nicholas I., narrowed and hardened into a close league for crushing out, within the limits of its sphere, all motions towards national independence or constitutional change. Its principles were last applied in the fateful intervention of the Tsar Nicholas in Hungary, on behalf of the Habsburg Monarchy, in 1849. It did not survive the Crimean War and the death of the Emperor Nicholas, the last uncompromising representative of its principles. Thenceforth it was but a memory, accursed in the eyes of the triumphant Liberalism of the age, its original character and aims forgotten or distorted by the legitimate prejudices aroused by its later developements, until in 1898 another Nicholas of Russia summoned its uncorrupted spirit from the dead to aid him to convert a warring world to the gospel of perpetual peace.

It remains to consider what light the history of the Holy Alliance throws on the problems presented by the present peace movement. It may be argued that it can throw very little light upon them; that the conditions of to-day are wholly different from those which existed in Europe a hundred years ago; that the Powers who constituted the Grand Alliance were for the most part autocrats selfishly bent on safeguarding their dynastic interests; and that the territorial system which they set themselves to maintain was an artificial one which, sooner or later, was bound to suffer violent disruption, since it took no heed of legitimate national aspirations. The assumption that these conditions have now been fundamentally changed lies at the very root of the question so far as the more extreme pacificists are concerned. But is the assumption well grounded? It is true that it is now the rule for the people in civilised countries to have a share in the responsibility of government; and the people are assumed to be averse from war.* It is true also that the rearrangement of national boundaries, as the outcome of the diplomacy and the wars of the nineteenth century, has satisfied some of the more dangerous revolutionary aspirations against which the Holy Alliance had to contend; but it is none the less true that the new Holy Alliance, of which the pacificists dream, would be faced by very much the same problems as those which confronted Alexander and his allies. They too propose to establish their international system on the principle of the preservation of the *status quo*—indeed, there is no other practical principle conceivable; they too would apply the principles of the Troppau Protocol, by empowering the

* Sir Thomas Barclay rightly points to universal service as the main cause of the objection of the Continental peoples to war.

Universal Union, in the event of any State violating, or threatening to violate, the public law of the world, to bring it to reason 'by peaceful means, or if need be by arms.' Now, it might be possible that, as Sir Frederick Pollock points out,* 'contests for supremacy or predominant influence,' which in their very nature cannot be 'disposed of by argument,' might be effectually prevented by a coalition of Powers of superior collective strength which 'should be prepared to enforce the 'principles which now stand unanimously acknowledged by 'the Second Peace Conference of the Hague.' This would, in effect, be to apply the principle which the Grand Alliance directed against France, that of a coalition *ad hoc*. But if an attempt were made to expand this coalition into a 'uni-'versal union' and to base its action, not on the exigencies of circumstances as they arise, not on the particular joint interests recognised by all the parties to it, but on the general right of the world-organisation to coerce its refractory members —what becomes of the sovereign independence of nations? Especially it would be the small States whose independence would be prejudiced; for though International Law recognises in theory the equality of all sovereign States, no international system which should attempt to translate this theory into practice would survive. If, on the other hand, the voting power of the central 'directory' were to be proportioned to the size and importance of its constituent States, the result would be precisely such a hegemony of the Great Powers as was exercised by the Grand Alliance after 1815. Nor is it extravagant to suppose that the new Holy Alliance, thus constituted, would develope, *mutatis mutandis*, very much on the lines of the old. It would begin by repudiating the principle of intervention, only in the end to find itself compelled to intervene; for, in new forms, the old difficulty of drawing a sharp distinction between external affairs and 'internal affairs having an 'external effect' would be sure to emerge. For the truth is, as Sir Frederick Pollock points out, that the effective working of an international federal system demands a far greater uniformity of political institutions and ideas among the nations of the world than at present exists. The same truth was realised by the sovereigns and statesmen of the Holy Alliance, and they attempted to secure the necessary uniformity by forcing their own model on the European States; not primarily in the interests of despotism, but in the supposed interests of the general peace of society.

* Cambridge Modern History, xii. p. 719.

Moreover, if we study the map of the world it is impossible not to be struck with the fact that national boundaries, even in Europe, are still in the highest degree 'artificial.' The function of a new League of Peace would again be, like that of the Holy Alliance, to protect these artificial boundaries: to attempt, that is to say, to stereotype political systems with which, certainly in many cases, the people who live under them are not content. The attempt would be even less likely to succeed now, when the spirit of nationalism is strong, than a hundred years ago, when it was in its weak beginnings. We may hold what opinion we like about the reasonableness or unreasonableness of these particularist ambitions; the point is that they exist. They exist even in the ranks of the adherents of the peace movement, whose cosmopolitanism is often subject to serious reservations. That of the Poles, for instance, which—according to a correspondent of the Baroness von Suttner*—makes them more amenable than the Germans to the influence of the propaganda, is not enough to outweigh their Polish patriotism: first Poland must be free and independent, then peace.† Thus, too, Mazzini had dreamed of perpetual peace; but first Italy must be united under a republican government, and the other 'oppressed nationalities' of Europe secured in their rights.

The new Holy Alliance, then, like the old, would find itself face to face with revolutionary forces, which it would have to repress, except in the very improbable event of its being willing to conciliate them by conceding their extreme demands: the satisfaction of every nationalist aspiration, and the universal establishment of pure democracy under republican forms. In any case, sooner or later, conflicting ideals would struggle within it for the mastery, and in the end it would not bring peace, but a sword. We may, then, without being unfaithful to the true cause of peace, adopt towards such programmes as that of the American Peace Society the attitude of Rousseau towards the 'project' of the Abbé de St. Pierre, 'admire so beautiful a plan 'but console ourselves for not seeing it put into execution, 'since that cannot be done save by means violent and redoubt-'able to humanity.'

---

* Letter of Baron Kübeck, 'Memoiren,' p. 198.

† Prince Camillo Stahremberg, writing to the Baroness, mentions that he has had an interesting letter from Poland, that its writer was 'warm' for the peace project, but maintained that there could be no permanent peace until Poland was once more an independent kingdom. Ibid. p. 262.

Art. VIII.—THE INTERNATIONAL MAP OF THE WORLD.

1. *Rapport du Président de la Commission pour l'établissement d'une carte de la terre à l'échelle de* 1 : 1,000,000. Sixth International Geographical Congress. London. 1895.

2. *Die Erdkarte im Massstab* 1 : 1,000,000. Von Prof. Dr. Albrecht Penck ; and *Résolutions et Vœux : I. The Map of the World on the scale of* 1 : 1,000,000. Neuvième Congrès International de Géographie, Genève, 1908.

3. *Resolutions and Proceedings of the International Map Committee assembled in London, November* 1909. London. 1910.

4. *International Map, Sheets North K* 35 (*Istambul*) *and South H* 34 (*Kenhardt*). Geographical Section, General Staff, War Office. 1912.

The publication of the first sheets of the international map of the world on the scale of one in a million marks the beginning of a new epoch in cartography. For the first time we are to have a map of the world on a uniform system, in which all the sheets are arranged to fit together along the margins ; uniform in their manner of reckoning longitudes, from the meridian of Greenwich ; uniform in their manner of reckoning heights, in metres above the mean level of the sea. They will have the same method of indicating the relief of the land, the same conventional signs for towns and roads, the same styles of lettering to distinguish between physical and political features. In a word, the whole map will be written in the same language, without difference even of idiom, and who learns to read one sheet may read them all. A very slight acquaintance with existing maps will serve to show how great is the advantage in prospect.

No useful art has made more real progress in the last ten years than the art of cartography as it is employed in the production of the sheets of a topographical survey. Improvements in the processes of colour printing have kept pace with the ambitions of the cartographer, so that he can without difficulty put a dozen or more impressions in different colours on a single sheet ; for the first time he can produce a map which is legible at a glance to the man who is trained to read it. And this facility in map-reading is so essential to comfort in motoring, and to safety in flying, that the art of map-making, its principles

and possibilities, has acquired in the last few years an altogether new importance.

At the recent meeting of the British Association at Portsmouth the section of Geography had a discussion on the subject of aero-maps. The French *Service géographique* and the British War Office had produced tentative-special maps for their military aviators, and the promoters of the great flying circuits which had then just achieved a spectacular success had furnished the competitors with specially devised route maps of the courses. The Portsmouth discussion afforded the first opportunity of comparing notes and of estimating the degree of success which had attended these special attempts at making a new class of map for the use of the airmen.

A strong diversity of opinion became apparent at once. The military aviators were not pleased with their special maps; they declared that the ordinary half-inch or quarter-inch maps, though not perfect, were more useful than any others. The civilian flying men, less trained in map-reading than the soldiers, complained that they could not read the Ordnance Survey maps and demanded something simpler. But to this the soldier had the convincing reply that the only man who had never lost his way in a competition flight was 'M. Beaumont,' who used throughout the ordinary survey maps, while all the competitors who had relied on the maps prepared for their guidance had come to grief. An aviator must learn to read maps as he learns to humour a petrol engine, and the lesson of the first summer's serious flying will not be lost on those who have to educate the airman. At the same time it gives a fresh impulse to the efforts of the national survey departments to spare no pains in rendering their maps continually more legible and more complete.

The difficulties of the cartographer begin when he tries to represent the relief of the ground upon the flat sheet of the map. The map must take the place of a model, and of a model so lighted that every part of it is seen in true and just relief—a condition which even with a model is far from easy of attainment. The model must not be lighted vertically, or all sense of relief is lost, as in the moon at full, which in the telescope is as disappointing an object as one may see. Let the model be lighted with oblique light, and we are confronted with a new set of difficulties. The slopes in shadow seem to be steeper than the slopes in the light; and there is little or nothing to show the broader differences of level, to distinguish the mountainous high plateau from the equally rugged ground several thousand feet below. A topographical map must therefore do

more than a well-lighted model can do when it is viewed from above; it must distinguish clearly the absolute as well as the relative relief.

To do this colour is essential. The beautiful copper-plate engravings which did duty as maps twenty years ago failed altogether in this respect. Take as an example the old engraved map of Switzerland, a piece of engraving of the highest class. It shows, inevitably, that a great part of the country is made of very steep slopes; but it does nothing effectual to distinguish between the places that are two thousand and the places that are ten thousand feet above sea level: nothing, that is to say, which can be distinguished at a glance without patient tracing of contours and minute decipherment of 'spot 'heights.' A map begins to be a success when the general lie of the ground can be discerned over the whole sheet at once; on such a map the commander of an army can scheme his strategy, and anyone can make his plans for getting about the country in any way he desires. When success is judged by this standard the successful map is the product of the last few years. Until the use of colour became possible there was no hope of being able to produce a really graphic map: and this was doubtless one of the reasons why the production of the international map on the scale of one in a million was so long delayed.

It was proposed by Professor Penck, of Vienna (since of Berlin), at the international congress of geographers which assembled in 1891 at Berne. At the next congress, held in London in 1895, the scheme had so far advanced that a number of general resolutions were voted, and detailed proposals for the division of the sheets and their methods of construction were adopted. Then for thirteen years one heard very little of the project. In 1908 it was revived at the congress of Geneva; more resolutions were voted; and there seemed to be every chance that they would remain as inoperative as those that had gone before them, for the congress that voted them had no executive power to carry them into effect. But, very fortunately for the enterprise, the Power that is most interested in a worldwide map was served in the Geographical section of its newly created General Staff by officers of exceptional strength, in a position to urge the step that was necessary, to lead to a realisation of the project so long discussed.

'At the International Geographical Congress which assembled at Geneva in 1908 certain detailed resolutions on the subject of the production of an international map, on the scale of 1: 1,000,000,

were unanimously voted. The Swiss Government forwarded these resolutions to the British Government, and the latter Government, realising that the resolutions would remain inoperative until officially adopted, issued invitations to the Governments of Austria-Hungary, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Russia, Spain, and the United States to send delegates to an official committee, which should discuss the question of standardising the international map, and should make definite recommendations. The British Government also invited delegates from the Dominion of Canada and the Commonwealth of Australia. All the countries and dominions above mentioned, with the exception of Japan, accepted the invitation.'

The long discussions which had taken place in the congresses of 1895 and 1908 had fairly cleared the ground for the labours of this committee, especially on the two points that were likely to be troublesome: the choice of the initial meridian, and the choice of the unit of length to be used in the representation of heights. As to the former, there could be in reality very little difference of opinion. If there was to be a prime meridian at all, then the choice of the meridian of Greenwich was almost inevitable, for the maps and charts whose longitudes were referred to that meridian were greater in number than the totality of maps and charts referred to all other meridians together. Only one other meridian with any claim to universality was in use: the meridian of the island of Ferro, which preserves on some few maps the memory of the great Papal division of the world between the Portuguese and the Spaniards. On this occasion the meridian of Ferro had no supporters; it must be Greenwich or none, for there was no other that had any claims to acceptance. But at first the representatives of France proposed to strike a bargain of the kind which is familiar to all who have followed the negotiations preceding the adoption by that country of the time of Western Europe: they would adopt the meridian of Greenwich if Great Britain would adopt the metric system. It is curious that anyone could deem this a fair bargain. A change of time once for all is the easiest thing in the world to make, and any confusion that may be produced is almost momentary. Lest the advocates of 'daylight saving' should seize upon this remark as an acceptance of their principle, let us say at once that the essence of the proposition is in the words 'once 'for all,' and that a change backwards and forwards twice a year is a very different thing. On the other hand, the adoption by Great Britain of the metric system in everyday affairs would be a change which, even if it is desirable, would make difficulties and confusions and expense for a very long time.

The case for the general use of the metric system on the international map is much stronger. The map is for scientific purposes; it is essential that the unit of length employed in the construction of the contours should be uniform; the metre is adopted by all the countries concerned with the exception of the United States, Russia, and Great Britain; and the latter shows that peculiar inconsistency in measures which is her boast and pride by using the yard for horizontal distances and the foot for vertical intervals. Nevertheless in 1895 the committee which reported on the scheme for the international map had to deplore that 'les délégués d'Angleterre 'se sont refusés, d'une façon énergique, à employer le système 'métrique sur leurs feuilles; cela rendrait dès l'abord, disent-'ils, la carte impopulaire en Angleterre et en compromettrait 'la vente.'

This did not prevent the adoption in 1895 of the meridian of Greenwich as the prime meridian of the map. Finding that the bargain they proposed was unacceptable, the delegates of France voted nevertheless for the Greenwich meridian, for, said Professor de Lapparent,

'aucun principe rationnel n'était engagé dans la question du choix d'un méridien. Il y a bien, pour certaines nations, un peu d'amour-propre en cause, mais quant à nous, nous nous sommes rappelés le mot de Henri IV: que Paris vaut bien une messe, et j'estime que les géographes soucieux de l'intérêt de la géographie, et de l'union de tous sur le terrain de la science, doivent se dire que la confection d'une carte internationale vaut bien un méridien.'

At this point in the discussion a German delegate, Professor Wagner, made a spirited protest against the whole enterprise.

'Was hat die Commission bisher zu Stande gebracht?

'Sie hat ein Gradnetz für eine Karte der Erde im Massstab von 1:1,000,000 beschlossen, nicht eine Karte der Erde. Alle diese Dinge: Gradnetz, Massstab, Anfangsmeridian, &c., sind nothwendige Voraussetzungen, aber doch im gewissen Sinne nur Aeusserlichkeiten, der Inhalt der Karte ist die Hauptsache. Von dem Inhalt der Karte, von der Möglichkeit ihrer Ausführung habe ich weder in dem Rapport von Bern noch hier etwas gehört. . . . In unseren Augen ist die Millionen Karte ein Phantom.'

But few were ready to follow the speaker to this gloomy conclusion. 'Le Metropolitan Railway de Londres n'a pas 'été fait en un jour,' replied a French delegate; 'peu à peu 'seulement cette œuvre grandiose a pu être achevée.' The sheets of a new map are not produced so fast that the surveys

cannot keep ahead when they have so long a start as they had on the international map.

Thus the Congress of 1895 adopted a framework and a few general resolutions, and the scheme appeared to go to sleep for thirteen years. It was, in fact, a little before its time. But in that interval several survey departments—French, German, and British—were making trial of what could be done upon this scale of one in a million, which was in some ways a novelty, half way between the topographical maps on a larger scale and the atlas maps upon a smaller scale with whose peculiarities map makers were already familiar.

The experience thus gained enabled the official committee, when it met in 1909, not only to adopt a detailed scheme, but to adopt it with unanimity. The one stumbling block had been removed by the resolution of the British representatives to accept the representation of heights in the metric system. With this decision none but the most hardy enthusiasts for the British foot will disagree. 'The values in feet, or other 'national unit, may be added, to the nearest unit, if desired.' But in the first British sheets to be published that desire, if it was ever expressed, has not been met.

Since the international committee finished its labours in November 1909 four sheets of the map have been completed and are published, or are on the eve of publication. Of these the one United States sheet is so far from conforming to the agreement that it must evidently be treated as a preliminary essay, and need not be discussed here. The other sheets are British. One, of the north of Scotland, by the Ordnance Survey, has been seen in proof, but at the time of writing is not yet on sale. Two others, a sheet of Turkey and Bulgaria, and one of north western Cape Colony, have been prepared in the Geographical section of the General Staff, printed in their new quarters in Whitehall, and are now on sale. The War Office is to be congratulated on the fact that its map reproduction department is first in the field with finished sheets, as its officers were foremost in the steps which led to the practical realisation of the scheme.

With the text of the resolutions of the international committee before us, with the attached sheet of conventional signs and styles of type, and with the first finished sheets to show how the resolutions which read so well in the abstract have stood the test of practice, we are now able to form for the first time a considered judgement of the enterprise.

The first impression of the general style of the maps is altogether favourable. The sheet of Istambul (Constantinople)

has a scholarly air quite novel in a map, and it is due in the first place to the care which has been taken in the spelling and transliteration of names. A place is called not by the name which it commonly bears in English, but by the transliteration into the Latin character, according to the official system if such exists, of the actual name of the place in Turkish or Greek, Rumanian or Bulgarian. The last word gives us an example of the educational character of this map. Ninety-nine per cent. of Englishmen speak of Bulgaria with the penultimate syllable as short as it can possibly be. The map gives us Bulgarija, and the little dictionary of pronunciation at the margin tells us that in Bulgaria the *j* is pronounced as in German. Many of the ninety-nine will be pleased to know the value of that penultimate syllable, and will be tempted to explore the map further in search of more. Turkey exists no more on the map; we have Memaliki Osmanie in its place, with capital Istambul (and Constantinople in brackets as a help); Eastern Roumelia is no more, and no name replaces it, but its capital is Plovdiv (Philippopolis). A voyage through Ak Deniz (Aegean Sea) and Ak Deniz Boghazi (Dardanelles) takes us to Mermer Denizi (Sea of Marmara) and thence by Istambul Boghazi (Bosporus) into Kara Deniz (the Black Sea). It seems to us that this enhances in an extraordinary way the interest of the map, and that for its transliteration alone the map was worth making. For the first time, to many of us, it is possible to make something better than a shot at the pronunciation of Bulgarian and Rumanian place names: to distinguish between the sounds of *c*, *ć*, *č*, *dž*, *š*, *ž*, and *j* in Bulgarijan; and we look forward to the chance of doing the same in Magyar and in other strange tongues. In the case of Chinese place names we are promised the system of transliteration adopted in the post and customs service. One thing alone is missing: the international committee said nothing about a guide to the pronunciation of British place names.

An admirable feature of the map is the system of characters employed in the lettering. Many attempts have been made to distinguish between features of different kinds by differences in the character of the lettering which is attached to them, and many of the attempts have failed because in the effort to obtain distinction of character there has been a sacrifice of legibility. Some of the Italian maps are notable examples of this defect. The names of the mountains are engraved in a character which is called 'engrossing,' and though it serves well enough to show that some distinction is intended it is, in itself, almost illegible upon the map. A study of the characteristic sheet

of the international map shows that great care has been taken to choose styles of lettering that shall be distinct from one another and all equally legible; but one must see a completed sheet to appreciate the full measure of the success which has been attained. As an example to all cartographers this map is invaluable; it is much to be hoped that it will have a permanent influence upon the production of all future maps.

In the past one has been apt to suppose that all successful lettering is engraved upon copper, and that no other process could compare with its results in clearness and beauty of line. Since the production of the new French map on the scale of 1 : 50,000, and of these sheets of the one in a million map, this opinion must be revised. We believe that the admirable results of the French map are obtained by drawing with a point upon a thin film of white pigment spread upon glass, and from that plate the photo-etched zinc plate is made. In the British War Office map, we understand, a great part of the work was drawn on an enlarged scale on tracing paper, reduced by photography, and photo-etched on copper. The excellence of the result leads us to hope that we may see a great change in the cost of producing maps of the highest class. Up to the present nothing had been found to equal engraved work, and the cost of engraving the names was a large part of the whole cost. The new process reduces the cost in a considerable degree, because it is easier and quicker to draw the names than to cut them into the copper; still it is a tedious business to draw each name, while attempts to stamp the names from types have resulted in coarse and ugly effects, and no one has succeeded in finding a way of copper-plate engraving with the pantagraph. The success of the etching on copper from an enlarged original suggests that perhaps the problem to be solved is simpler than it appeared; and that it may be possible to print from type on an enlarged sheet of names, gaining the requisite fineness of line in the reduction. But we are adventuring beyond the bounds of a review.

The sheets of the international map are uniform in size, covering six degrees of longitude by four of latitude, up to 60° of latitude north or south; nearer the Poles, where the convergence of the meridians has shrunk the length of a degree of longitude to less than half its length on the equator, each sheet is to cover twelve degrees of longitude. Scotland is well situated to illustrate the drawbacks of so hard and fast a rule. Scotland comes just below the parallel of 60° north; therefore its sheet must be six degrees and not twelve degrees of longitude in breadth, although the degrees have

shrunk so much that the sheet is little more than half the width of an equatorial sheet, and is considerably taller than it is wide. The greater part of northern Scotland falls on one sheet, but the western islands extend on to the next, which is otherwise empty. There is nothing except the hard rule of uniformity to prevent the showing of the whole upon a single sheet, and we are inclined to think that in such cases it would be much better to defy the rule for the benefit of the map.

In the sheet which we shall have in due course of the southern parts of England we shall find that in accordance with the international agreement the meridian of Greenwich is the edge of a sheet; the eastern outskirts of London and the estuary of the Thames will be cut off and we shall have to seek them on a sheet of north-eastern France and Belgium. In such a case it would seem that there can be nothing but harm in holding oneself bound by the strict letter of the law. The boundaries of the sheets must have some elasticity, which can be given to them readily without in any way obscuring the strict conventional limits. In all cases where a little piece of one country is cast on a neighbouring sheet and cut off from its obvious relation with the principal body it must be permissible to include it on an extension of the sheet to which it most naturally belongs. There is nothing new in this, for it is already practised on the modern sheets of the one-inch map of England. Those annoying sheets with a square mile or two of land and a poor shillingsworth of empty sea are fast being absorbed into their neighbours. A like discretion must be exercised in producing the sheets of the international map.

Indeed we would go farther and say that it should be a general practice on all the sheets, and not merely on those which border the sea or divide a frontier awkwardly, that the edge should not be hard and fast, but so to speak nebulous, carrying over any feature that suffers from bisection, and showing a little of what is happening on the other side of that artificial line, the conventional edge of the sheet. This excellent plan has been adopted with good effect in the maps of France on the scale of 1 : 50,000 to which we have already referred, and to which we shall find ourselves referring again when we want to find examples of liberal ideas in map-making. There is every reason for giving it a much more extended trial than it has yet received. The Istambul sheet gives us a case in point. To the S.S.W. of Samothraki, on the edge of the sheet, appears a little point of land bearing a single name Plaka Burnu; the style of the lettering tells us that this is the name of a physical feature, and a glance at the neighbouring coast tells

us that Burnu and Burun seem to be Turkish for 'cape.' But there is nothing to tell us that this cape is the northern point of the large island of Lemnos, which could be shown most readily if the sheet had been given a borderland such as we have desired.

On another, though connected matter, we find that the rules are oppressive. The sheets are numbered in a way that conveys nothing whatever of their place on the globe : nothing, that is to say, to the ordinary senses. For a reason that does not appear in the accounts of the deliberations of the committee the sheets of the map are numbered thus : the Istambul sheet is North K 35. The letter K signifies the zone of latitude 40° to 44°, the eleventh zone from the Equator as K is the eleventh letter of the alphabet ; the number 35 signifies the 35th lune of longitude, each of six degrees, reckoned eastwards from the meridian opposite to that of Greenwich. Thus, if one remembers the rules, a short calculation leads to the result that this sheet covers Latitude N. 40° to 44°, Longitude E. 24° to 30° ; and the same end would have been attained if the sheet number had been simply the position of the middle point of the sheet N. 42°, E. 27° ; a scheme too simple for an international committee, perhaps, but a great deal more useful to others. These numbers are indeed given in a minute diagram on the lower margin ; but why not in bold figures as the sheet number ?

The meridians and parallels on the sheets of the map are constructed on the system known as the polyconic projection. Into the highly technical question of the choice of the projection for a map we have no need to enter, especially since in the case of the international map it is of little real interest. The area of a sheet is not so large that there can be any question of serious misrepresentation, whatever reasonable projection may be adopted ; it is sufficient to choose that one which makes it possible to have a perfect fit along the borders with the neighbouring sheets, and one that may be constructed with simplicity ; it is not undesirable that it should possess some small refinement that shall stamp it as the projection of the international map. In all these respects the slightly modified polyconic projection that has been adopted fulfils its purpose to perfection. The tables for the construction of the map of the whole world occupy but two pages. They contain a refine ment that is quite invisible upon the printed sheet, and makes no practical difference at all, but which has a theoretical elegance which will appeal to all connoisseurs of the subject.

We come now to the matter of real difficulty and of first-rate

importance—the method of representing the relief of the ground. We cannot discuss it without dealing in technicalities ; and we shall not hesitate to do so, because it seems to us that the questions involved are some of the most interesting that have been proposed for solution within the last few years. They really are new, for they did not arise until it became possible to print the maps from a dozen or more plates in different colours. They belong to a scientific art which is still in the experimental stage, whose principles are as yet not well established or very much discussed ; at least there is no book with which we are acquainted which makes much attempt to deal with them.

The basis of any system must be lines of equal height above sea-level, or contours, using the word contour in its true sense, and not in that which has most unfortunately been given it in certain books for motorists : for example, the ' Contour Road ' Book of England,' which is not a book of contours but of profiles, very different things. The contour is a level line of the country, generally at a round number of feet or of metres above the mean level of the sea on the adjacent coasts. With a minimum of obstruction to the map it gives a maximum of information. When the contours are spaced at equal vertical intervals one may read at a glance the shape of the ground by considering their horizontal distances apart upon the map, for where they come close together the ground is steep, and by their shapes one may distinguish all the peaks and spurs and saddles of a range. A closely contoured map is thus the equivalent of a model in three dimensions, if only it is possible to read the contours when they become complex in steep and difficult country. We have but to turn to the well-known maps of Switzerland on the scale of 1 : 50,000 or to the recently published War Office map of Basutoland to see that close contours may very soon become illegible. The eye cannot follow their course, especially when it is broken by cliffs on which they cannot be shown ; by minute study with a glass one may unravel a small area, but any attempt to take in the structure of a district is almost hopeless.

By strengthening every fifth or every tenth contour a great deal can be done to guide the eye, as is seen on the maps of the United States ; but this is not enough, and we must look for further help in superposing on the contours another system, of hill-shading, or of colouring on the ' layer system ' as it is not very adequately named in English. Hill-shading is a developement of the engraved ' hachures ' which make illegible the old black maps of last century. Hill-shading in light brown or grey serves to show where slopes exist, which is already shown

by the contours ; but it does not show the essential point, which direction is up hill and which is down, unless the shade is drawn as if it were cast by an oblique light. We have not on the British maps any examples of oblique hill-shading ; but it is common abroad, and any of the Italian maps will show at once its principal defect, that the slope in the shadow inevitably looks steeper than the slope in the light, unless the contours are drawn emphatically. To overcome this defect they have adopted on the new French map a double system, of a vertical shade in a pale tint of bistre, with an oblique shade of purple-grey superposed. Where the ground is not too steep—for example, on the Versailles sheet—this produces an admirable effect. But it is expensive ; and it becomes overburdening in mountainous country such as that behind Nice. Hill-shading, in fact, is excellent on moderately undulating country and impossible in mountainous, at least when the scale is small. The system finds no place on the international map.

The system of colouring in layers, or hypsometric tints as it is sometimes called, has been familiar to us for many years on the maps of Mr. Bartholomew, and has been used more lately on the half-inch map of the Ordnance Survey. Simple in principle, it is very uncertain in its results in practice. Every part of the map which lies between two contours, say, between 100 and 200 feet in elevation, is coloured to a definite tint ; a slightly different tint is used for the next step in elevation and so on, until the whole map is covered with colour denoting the height above sea of its various parts. It is clear that success depends upon a nice adjustment of the tints so that there shall nowhere be a contrast between one layer and the next ; though the differences in tint are recognisable yet they shall nowhere become so heavy that the underlying detail is obscured ; and, finally, the sequence of colours must suggest the effect of relief. These conditions are very arduous. No more than about seven tints of a single colour can be produced without getting the stronger so heavy that it is impossible to read anything below it. As soon as we try to pass from one colour to another we meet with the difficulty that the transition is more marked than other transitions in the series, and our second condition is violated. Moreover, if we run from lighter to darker shades in one colour, we must continue in the next from darker to lighter, or the contrast at the change will be too pronounced ; and this inversion of the scheme destroys the sense of relief that we may learn to associate with either increasing or decreasing colour, but not with first one and then the other.

These difficulties are shown in a pronounced form on the British maps. For country up to about eight hundred feet they are excellent: see, for example, the beautiful sheet of London and the North Downs. Above a thousand feet they become impossible, as may be seen in the sheets of Dartmoor or of the Lakes. With these failures before them the Ordnance Survey modified the colour scheme for the Scotch map, with the result that the sheets took on a flat appearance and the sense of relief was lost. It is evident that success on the layer system is not to be achieved without failures.

In the surveys of continental Europe the layer system has been tried with very varying degrees of success. The early Swedish maps were the models for the first attempts of the Ordnance Survey, and their failures were the same. The Austrian General Staff map of Central Europe suffers in the same way from illegibility wherever the colour becomes heavy. One map alone has achieved a considerable success: the Bavarian General Staff map along the southern frontier between Munich and the Austrian Tyrol. Yet it is not easy to say exactly why this map is a success and others are failures. The contours are perhaps a little heavier than ordinary; the hill-shading is light and delicate; and the colour of the highest ground is a deep but very transparent red. The success of this map is due, perhaps, more to the care which has been taken in the printing to produce a perfect blending of the colours than to any peculiarity in the principle. It does, however, follow out a scheme which some contend is essential to a pleasant effect, that the transition from one colour to another must follow in the order of the spectrum: that is to say, that a change from green to yellow is pleasant, a change from green to orange is unpleasant. How far this is due to any precise physiological law is far from clear; as a working rule it appears to be successful, and the colour scale for the international map is based upon it, though perhaps with an imperfect idea of what is really red, and what only an unpleasant shade of magenta.

The scale approved by the committee provides for a change of tint at every hundred metres from sea-level to 600, proceeding thence by 200 metre steps to 1200; two steps of 400 to 2000; two of 500 to 3000; and thence by steps of 1000 metres. As one goes higher the steps become greater, which is a defect, but seemingly an inevitable defect if the number of separate printings is not to be increased beyond all possibility. Let us see how the scheme works on the three sheets which have come to hand.

We notice at once that the sheet of Istambul does not follow

strictly the international scale, and it seems to us that the change is by no means for the better. The intervals in the low ground are at steps of 200 metres instead of 100, with a consequent suppression of some of the more pleasant paler colours, and a rather sudden transition to the more violent shades of brown that are not the best part of the scale. We turn to the Kenhardt sheet of north-western Cape Colony, which follows the rules almost precisely; and we see at once how disastrous this layer system can be in country which is not suited to it. The greater part of the map is a strong brown colour on which the brown contours, the red roads, and the blue streams are equally spoiled. A moment's consideration shows what is wrong: the country rises very quickly from the sea to a height of 1000 metres, and between that and 2000 there are only three shades of colour, quite insufficient to show the relief of the high plateau. When the sheets of the Transvaal are published the case will be still worse, for the plateau is higher and the changes of tint in consequence less frequent. Yet it is absurd to contend that changes of height are less important on a plateau than they are on the lower ground; they are every bit as important, but on the scheme of the international map they will receive scant justice.

It was good forethought, not we believe accident, that prompted the Geographical section of the General Staff to bring out as soon as possible a sheet that should be a failure, for the sooner the international scheme breaks down the easier must it be to reconsider and modify it. We are faced with this situation, that the scheme will work very well in countries which are altogether below 1200 metres; and that it will not work at all for South Africa or for any country which has large regions at a great elevation above sea-level. It is necessary to consider at once what can be done to modify this serious defect in the scheme before many sheets are published and much money spent. It seems to be likely that the international committee, or rather the representatives of those countries that have actually done something, will find it necessary to meet in the course of a year or two, to compare notes and to make such amendments in the scheme as their experience of its working may have shown to be necessary. If this is so, we are not bound to consider the present international scheme as fixed for better or worse, and it is legitimate to discuss what improvements are possible.

The scale of one in a million is smaller than that of the more elaborate topographical sheets of which one has had experience in the past, and we may well enquire whether this

small scale is not responsible for some of the difficulties that have become apparent in the first published sheets of the international map. The layer system is not effective unless each layer is of sufficient breadth to allow the full effect of its own tint to make itself felt. Let the contours run too close together and the tints be laid in narrow streaks, and we lose at once the proper effect; the coloured details blend together and lose distinctness, just as one may see in a flower of complicated colouring how it becomes invisible at a little distance. We need only to look at the Scotch sheet to see that this is true, and that in many parts of the world the layer system fails because the contours are too close. But we have already seen that it fails also in the higher ground because one cannot find a sufficient number of clear transparent tints. We must conclude that for the map of one in a million the layer system of colouring is not generally suitable.

What may we propose in its place? The effect of a proposal can never be judged until an expensive experiment has been made, the drawing of a complete sheet by a skilled draughtsman. This circumstance goes far to make suggestion futile; yet it is ungracious to be critical when the criticism is merely destructive. We venture, then, to suggest that success will come, if at all, by keeping the contour interval uniform throughout, and colouring the contours themselves in groups according to some such scale as that now adopted for the system of layers. Let us admit at once that this will not be likely to give that physiological effect of relief which is possible on a larger scale, but is not possible, we believe, on the small scale of one in a million. The most that the coloured contours can do is to help the trained eye to read the map quickly, and that is really all that is required. If to this general plan we add that layer tints might be employed at discretion in the undulating country, we have a scheme with some elasticity, yet not too far removed from the obligatory inelastic provisions of the international agreement.

The real importance of the world map must be our excuse for this severely technical discussion of its most conspicuous defect. To return to the appreciation of its merits: It is the first attempt to provide a real topographical map of the world in a number of sheets which is not extravagantly great. The whole surface of the world would occupy something more than two thousand sheets, of which perhaps one-half would show nothing but sea, and will certainly be left to the last if they are published at all. A few hundred sheets will cover the surveyed parts of the civilised world, and it is not improbable

that civilisation and survey will keep ahead of the productive capacity of the drawing and printing offices for some time at least. But it seems to be of prime importance, when the study of geography has had infused into it a spirit wholly new, as any father may see if he will look at the school-books which his boys use now, that the production of this map should not languish because only a few sheets a year can be squeezed out of an already congested office. We would urge upon all libraries, and all colleges and schools, that they should buy each sheet as it appears and ask continually for more, so that a strong public interest should stimulate the supply in response to the demand.

And, finally, may we express the hope that the production of this map may bring to light much information that now lies hidden in the secret and confidential editions of military surveys outside the boundaries of the powers which make them? Is it any real advantage that so much of the geography of Asia Minor, for example, should be inaccessible because it was learned secretly at great expense? We have seen within the last few years some relaxation of the military pedantry which forbade the publication on British maps of the contours within a radius of 5000 yards of all military works. In the first number of the new 'Army Review' (July 1911) Colonel Close discusses the Maps of the Empire, and gives the answer to those who would desire that the military maps of one's own country should be kept secret.

'Maps are required by an army not only for war but for training, and training maps cannot well be kept secret. There is no satisfactory means of ensuring that enterprising neighbours shall not construct some sort of maps of our territories, even if we do not make them ourselves. In small wars with uncivilised or semi-civilised people, or with the imperfectly trained troops of a civilised nation, maps give us a great advantage. In a war with well-trained troops perfection of apparatus tells in favour of that army which is the better trained.

'And, finally, civilised States find the need of maps for social, scientific, executive, and administrative purposes, and such maps do not differ essentially from military maps.'

These arguments seem to need but slight extension to make them applicable to all cases in which geographical knowledge is in existence. It is required for commercial and for scientific purposes as much as for military. May we hope that no sheets of the international map will be left blank for military reasons that are perhaps a little out of date?

Art. IX.—CANADA DURING THE LAURIER RÉGIME.

1. *House of Commons Debates*, 1896–1911. Ottawa: Government Printing Bureau.
2. *Official Report of the Liberal Convention*, 1893. Toronto: Budget Printing and Publishing Company. 1893.
3. *Report of Proceedings in the Hearing by Members of the Government of the Farmers' Delegation*, December 16, 1910. Ottawa: C. H. Parmelee, King's Printer. 1910.
4. *The Siege of Ottawa.* Edited by G. F. Chipman. Winnipeg: Grain Growers' Guide. 1910.
5. *Synoptical History of the Grand Trunk System of Railways.* By R. S. Logan. Montreal. 1911.
6. *Fourth Report of Registrar of Boards of Conciliation and Investigation.* Ottawa: C. H. Parmelee. 1911.
7. *Fifth Report of Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada*, 1910. Ottawa: C. H. Parmelee. 1910.
8. *Seventh Annual Report of the Commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway.* Ottawa. 1911.
9. *Railway Statistics of the Dominion of Canada*, 1911. Ottawa: C. H. Parmelee. 1912.

In the days of the united provinces of Quebec and Ontario —in the troublous and difficult twenty-seven years that preceded confederation in 1867—instability of administrations was the characteristic of Canadian politics. Since confederation this characteristic has completely disappeared, and it has been usual for one political party to hold power continuously during the lifetime of three or four Parliaments. Between confederation and the downfall of the Conservative government in 1896, there had been eight general elections. At only two of these—1874 and 1896—were the Liberals successful; and when the Laurier government came into power in 1896, the Liberals had been continuously in opposition for nearly eighteen years. The late Sir John A. Macdonald was premier and leader of the Conservative party during thirteen of these eighteen years. He was premier until his death in 1891; and his name must always be associated with the developements that make the Conservative régime from 1878 to 1896 memorable in the history of the Dominion. During these eighteen years, confederation became an assured success. The Canadian Pacific railway was built, and a connexion

thereby established between the provinces on the St. Lawrence and the Atlantic coast and British Columbia on the Pacific. The Dominion was committed to the national policy of the Conservatives—to tariffs for the protection of Canadian industries; and a beginning was made with the filling up of Canada beyond the great lakes—with the developement of what are now the great grain-growing provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. Eight provinces constituted the confederation during the greater part of this period from 1878 to 1896; and at the end of it the time was approaching when the population in what were known as the Northwest Territories would be sufficiently large to warrant the creation of two new provinces—Saskatchewan and Alberta—provinces which came into the union in 1905.

Party lines in Canada are older than confederation. They are older even than the days of the united provinces. They existed when Quebec and Ontario—then known as Lower and Upper Canada—were organised as separate provinces under the constitution of 1791. The names Liberal-Conservative and Liberal—the names of the existing parties in Dominion and provincial politics—date back only to the legislature of the united provinces. In that period—1840–1867—the dividing line between the two parties was as well marked as the existing line between the Unionists and the Liberals and Radicals at Westminster. The clergy reserves, representation based upon population, and protection were the issues of this period; for a tariff to protect the manufacturers of Ontario and Quebec against all comers—British as well as American—was enacted by the legislature of the united provinces as early as 1858, although it is only since 1879 that a tariff to this end has constituted the main part of the national policy—the policy which was originated by the Conservatives under the leadership of Macdonald. The question of the clergy reserves and their use, and the representation of the two provinces in the legislature, were settled before confederation. It was at the time when the question of the clergy reserves was nearing settlement, when the two parties were approaching an agreement on it, that the Tories abandoned their old name and substituted for it the name of Liberal-Conservatives; and the Radicals, who in Ontario had been known as the Grits, adopted the name of Liberals. Both political parties had traditions that went back to the period before the rebellion of 1837. These traditions did not lose their potency at confederation; but it may be said that from 1867 to 1896 the only dividing line between

the Liberal-Conservatives and the Liberals was the national policy.

In the days of the united provinces both parties were strongly influenced by the principles of the political parties in England. The Liberal party in Ontario in particular was much influenced by the large immigration in those years from England and Scotland; and when the protective tariffs of 1858 and 1859—known in Canadian fiscal history as the Cayley and Galt tariffs—were enacted, they were opposed by Liberals in the legislature, and by the Liberal newspapers of Toronto and Montreal. A low tariff was on the statute book at confederation. It had been enacted in 1866, and was the last tariff act of the legislature of Quebec and Ontario. The movement for confederation at this time, and also the strong desire of all the British North American provinces for a renewal of the reciprocity treaty of 1854–66 with the United States, had checked the movement for protection in Ontario and Quebec; and when this tariff of 1866 was enacted the general range of duties on imports was put back to fifteen per cent., the level at which the duties had stood prior to the protectionist changes made by the Cayley tariff in 1858. Some protective duties were continued in 1866—notably on sugar, soap, and illuminating oils; but in general the tariff on the statute book at confederation was for revenue only, and the protection then enjoyed by most Canadian manufacturers was incidental to the method by which the Dominion revenue was raised.

The tariffs of the maritime provinces in the years preceding confederation were devoid of protection for the manufacturers of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. At no time did the duties in these tariffs exceed ten per cent.; and these duties were levied only as a means of raising revenue to meet the comparatively small expenditures of the provincial governments. There was not much trade or communication in those days between the maritime provinces and Quebec and Ontario. The imports of these provinces were from Great Britain and the United States; and except coal and pig iron the maritime provinces had little to sell to Quebec and Ontario. But the existence of the protectionist movement in Ontario and Quebec and the enactment of the Cayley and Galt tariffs were known in the maritime provinces; and this knowledge formed an obstacle in the way of bringing them into confederation, to overcome which the fathers of confederation found it necessary to give assurances to the maritime provinces. 'They found it necessary,' said Mr. Fielding, when as Minister

of Finance in the Laurier administration of 1896–1911 he made his first budget speech in the House of Commons,

'to give to the people of the maritime provinces the most sacred and solemn assurances that if this union could be accomplished the maritime provinces would not have to assume the burden and responsibility of a high tariff. True, you will not find that in the British North America Act; but I undertake to say that it was an unwritten treaty between the promoters of the union and their friends in the maritime provinces, and it is but fair to say that in the beginning that treaty was observed.' *

Except for the short-lived tariff of 1870 that imposed protective duties on flour, salt and coal, this unwritten treaty was observed until 1879. The general election in 1878 was fought—at least in Quebec and Ontario—on the question of protection for Canadian industries. Macdonald as leader of the Conservative opposition in the Parliament of 1874–78 had formulated the national policy while the Liberals under the late Alexander Mackenzie were in power; and at the general election Macdonald's policy was endorsed by the constituencies. The first of the national policy tariffs, with protective duties as high as thirty-five and forty per cent., was enacted in 1879; and thenceforward until 1896 the dividing line between Conservatives and Liberals on the question of protection reappeared in Parliament, in the constituencies, and in the press.

Alexander Mackenzie, who was the only Liberal premier of Canada before Sir Wilfrid Laurier formed his administration in 1896, the late Mr. Edward Blake, who in 1878 succeeded Mackenzie as leader of the Liberal opposition, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who in turn succeeded Mr. Blake in 1890, Sir Richard Cartwright, Sir William Mulock, Mr. W. Paterson, Sir Louis Davies, and the late Mr. David Mills—in fact all the leaders of the Liberal party in Dominion politics between 1878 and 1896 continuously opposed the national policy; and in Parliament and in the constituencies these leaders pledged the Liberal party to the repeal of the protective tariff and to the enactment of a tariff from which all direct protection to Canadian manufacturers should be eliminated. During the earlier years of the Macdonald régime the Liberals opposed the policy of the Conservatives with regard to the Canadian Pacific railway, and predicted a breakdown of that great undertaking. They opposed the Conservative policy of land grants to

* Speech by Mr. W. H. Fielding, House of Commons Debates, April 22, 1897.

promoters of railways. They advocated a reform of the Senate, to which between 1878 and 1896 none but supporters of the Conservative government were appointed. They advocated a reform of the civil service and the elimination of politics from appointments in it. They criticised the administrative policies of the government, and they condemned the scandal and corruption by which the Conservative régime was so grievously marked. They complained also with much bitterness of the gerrymandering of constituencies under the redistribution acts of 1882 and 1892; and in the last two years of the period from 1878 to 1896 the Liberals were sharply at issue with the government over the concessions which it was proposed to make to the Roman Catholic Church in the province of Manitoba in connexion with the schools.

From beginning to end, these eighteen years were a period of much partisan bitterness. The Liberal opposition was compact, well organised, and of singular strength and vigour. It was exceptionally well led; and moreover it had much support in the constituencies, with which during all these years it kept in closest touch. It was aided by an effective press in Toronto, Montreal, Halifax, and other large centres of population east of the great lakes; and through this close touch of the leaders of the opposition with the constituencies there was more political education during this period than at any other time in the history of the Dominion. In the House of Commons the opposition was alert and aggressive; and the government, chiefly by the scandals and the corruption of that time, gave it many opportunities.

It was during the last five or six years of this period that Sir Wilfrid Laurier achieved his success as a leader of the Liberal party as distinct from his later success as premier of a Liberal government; and all through these years, as had been the case when Mr. Blake was leader from 1878 to 1890, Sir Wilfrid Laurier had the support of Sir Richard Cartwright, who later was Minister of Trade and Commerce in the Liberal government, and who is perhaps the most able parliamentarian of the House of Commons at Ottawa since confederation. From 1878 to 1896, while many questions divided the Conservatives and Liberals most of them were temporary; and after the Canadian Pacific railway had been carried across the continent in 1885, the one question on which a great principle was involved was the policy adopted by the Conservatives in 1879 of building up industries with the aid of bounties and high protective duties.

The position of the Liberals on the national policy from

1879 to 1896 was never in doubt. Their hostility to protection in and out of Parliament was steadfast and continuous. All the provinces except British Columbia were represented at a great Liberal convention at Ottawa in 1893—a conference which extended over two days, and at which there were speeches by all the Liberal leaders in Parliament and also by most of the Liberal leaders in the legislatures of the several provinces. At this convention, at which Sir Wilfrid Laurier presided, the first day's session was devoted to condemnation of the national policy in all its aspects ; and in the Ottawa programme adopted at this convention there was embodied a carefully prepared condemnation of the fiscal policy of the Conservatives. As this declaration was the epitome of the arguments against protection advanced by the Liberal leaders in the House of Commons and in the constituencies from 1879 to 1893, and as the Ottawa programme was the platform of the Liberals at the general election of 1896, it may be well to quote the declaration. It was as follows :—

' The customs tariff of the Dominion should be based, not as it is now, on the protective principle, but upon the requirements of the public service. The existing tariff, founded upon an unsound principle, and used as it has been by the government as a corrupting agency wherewith to keep themselves in office, has developed monopolies, trusts and combinations. It has decreased the value of farm and other landed property. It has oppressed the masses to the enrichment of a few. It has checked immigration. It has caused great loss of population. It has impeded commerce. It has discriminated against Great Britain. In these and in many other ways it has occasioned great public and private injury, all of which evils must continue to grow in intensity as long as the present tariff system remains in force. The highest interests of Canada demand a removal of this obstacle to our country's progress, by the adoption of a sound fiscal policy, which, while not doing injustice to any class, will promote domestic and foreign trade, and hasten the return of prosperity to our people. To this end the tariff should be reduced to the needs of honest, economical and efficient government. It should be so adjusted as to make free or to bear as lightly as possible upon the necessaries of life, and should be so arranged as to promote freer trade with the whole world, more particularly with Great Britain and the United States.

' We denounce the principle of protection as radically unsound and unjust to the masses of the people, and we declare our conviction that any tariff changes based on that principle must fail to afford any substantial relief from the burdens under which the country labours.'

As the national policy was the one question continuously

in Dominion politics from 1878 to 1896 it followed that this policy in its many aspects—the British preference, the tariff war with Germany, tariff relations with France and the United States, and bounties to the iron and steel industry—was the predominant question all through the Liberal régime from 1896 to 1911, when the Laurier government was defeated on the proposed reciprocity agreement with the United States. The Liberals when they revised the tariff in 1897 paid no heed to the declaration of the Ottawa convention. Influences which had their part in the adoption and maintenance of the national policy while the Conservatives were in power—those of the protected manufacturers and of the banking interests which were intertwined with the manufacturing interests—influences which seldom come into the open but which are invariably powerful behind the scenes when a tariff is about to be revised—came into play at Ottawa after the change of government in 1896. These forces, which are never permanently identified with one political party—which use a political party as long as it is available, and act with the opposite party just as soon as it comes into power—brought about the obliteration of all the pledges on the tariff made by the Liberals from 1879 to 1896, and dominated the revision of 1897. So completely was this the case that except for the British preference, the Liberals at this revision adopted the national policy of the Conservatives in its entirety—bounties as well as high protective duties—and in 1911 when the Laurier government went out of office the effective protection of most Canadian manufacturers not affected by the preferential tariff was much higher than it had been under any of the tariffs enacted by the Conservatives.

There was much disappointment among Liberals at this prompt repudiation of the Ottawa declaration at the first revision of the tariff by a House of Commons in which the Liberals had a majority; and it was a disappointment that would have made itself felt at the general election in 1900 had there been any party or group in the House of Commons which continued to hold the position on the national policy that the Liberals held from 1878 to 1896. There was some disquietude among the rank and file of the government's supporters in the House of Commons at the character of the revision of 1897. But with the caucus system as it exists at Ottawa, and with the power that the government there can exert over its supporters through the distribution of patronage and largesse in their constituencies, the cabinet has a larger measure of control over its adherents in the House of Commons than is the case even at Westminster.

The Liberal caucus in 1897 endorsed the tariff policy of the Laurier government. There was no serious opposition to it from the government benches in the House of Commons. There was no serious opposition later on in the same session to the renewal and extension of the system of bounties to industries which had originated with the Conservatives in 1883; and until the Liberals went out of office in 1911 there was no claim or pretence that the Laurier government was other than protectionist or that—the British preference excepted—there was any distinction between the national policy originated by the Conservatives and the national policy that the Liberal government had adopted and developed. The broad and well-marked dividing line between Conservatives and Liberals in the House of Commons on the tariff—the division to which the attention of the whole of the Dominion was directed at the Liberal convention in 1893—disappeared with the enactment of the first Fielding tariff in 1897. With its disappearance, however, all differences between Liberals and Conservatives on fiscal policy were not obliterated. After the Liberals in Parliament—as distinct from the Liberals in the constituencies—had become out-and-out protectionists, and had established relations with the beneficiaries of the tariff as intimate as those which had existed during the eighteen years that the Conservatives were in power, the differences between the government and the opposition were only on questions of detail; and had it not been for the activity of the farmers' organisations in Ontario and the grain-growers' organisations in the prairie country beyond the great lakes, all agitation in the constituencies against protection and bounties would have come to an end when the Laurier government abandoned the fiscal programme on which it had come into power.

The farmers in Canada are the only general consumers who are organised. It has never been practicable to organise consumers in the great urban centres of the Dominion. The local Conservative and Liberal associations are usually swayed by interested partisans. Especially is this the case with the local organisations of the party in power, for much government patronage of one kind or another goes to the active members of these associations; and after the Liberals at Ottawa had gone over to protection in 1897, the local associations followed the lead of the Liberal members, who had followed the caucus and the government at Ottawa. It was the same with most of the daily newspapers that had supported the Liberals in their condemnation of the national policy. The tie between

government and the newspapers is infinitely closer in Canada than in England. Since confederation a government press, variously and indirectly subsidised, has been as much a part of the machinery of government as a majority in the House of Commons. It was so when Macdonald and the Conservatives were in power. It was so during the fifteen years that the Liberals were in control; and after 1897 this Liberal press, taking its cue from Ottawa, dropped the Liberal programme of 1893, and ceased all criticism of protection and bounties. These journals now supported and effusively eulogised the national policy of the Liberal government; and the vigorous propaganda of 1879–96 against the national policy of the Conservatives, and for closer trade relations with the United States, would have come to an end had it not been for the granges in Ontario, the grain-growers' associations in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, and the independent newspapers in the small towns of these four provinces by which the farmers and grain-growers' associations are supported.

The farmers' organisations persistently continued the agitation that the Liberals had abandoned on attaining office. They made their influence felt at the second revision of the tariff in 1907, when the beneficiaries of the tariff and of the bounties organised in the Canadian Manufacturers' Association were demanding duties as high as those in the Dingley tariff that had been enacted at Washington in 1897. There was at first a disposition on the part of the government to comply with this demand of the extreme protectionists; and the policy of the government, as announced by Mr. Fielding in the House of Commons in 1904, was a minimum tariff applicable to what the Minister of Finance described as low tariff countries, and a maximum tariff to apply 'to 'such countries as do not manifest a disposition to trade 'with us.' *

By the manufacturers and also by the farmers and grain-growers this announcement of the government's policy was understood to mean that there would be a large and general increase in the duties on manufactured goods from the United States. This was the understanding, because at that time there was a tariff war between Germany and Canada arising out of the preference to Great Britain. In retaliation against discriminations against Canada on the part of Germany a heavy surtax was paid on imports from Germany; and with this already in force, the United States was obviously the

* Speech by Mr. Fielding, H. of C. Debates, June 7, 1904.

only country at which the proposed maximum tariff could be aimed.

Most Canadian manufacturers fear competition from the United States much more than from England or Germany. They accordingly welcomed the announcement of the new policy, which promised to go far beyond the Conservative tariffs of the years between 1878 and 1896. The farmers and grain-growers who are buyers of American goods, or of similar products made in Canada, on the other hand, were seriously alarmed at the prospect of duties approximating those of the Dingley tariff. Through their associations they made an early protest against any increase in duties on imports from the United States ; and to some extent the government heeded these protests ; for while duties on scores of articles were increased by from two and a half to seven and a half per cent., no duties corresponding to those of the Dingley tariff were enacted at the revision of 1907. It was at this revision that the granges and grain-growers' associations revived the old Liberal demand for reciprocity with the United States. The farmers kept this question in agitation from 1906 to 1910 ; and it was the growing strength of the grain-growers' movement in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, and the persistence with which the granges of Ontario, and the grain-growers' associations of the prairie provinces, pressed their demands for lower duties all through the tariff, for an extension of the British preference, and for reciprocity, that impelled the Laurier government at the end of 1910 to weaken a little on the policy of protection, and accept President Taft's overtures for a reciprocity agreement with the United States.

Sir Charles Tupper, one of the fathers of confederation, and a veteran leader of the Conservative party, was premier from May to July 1896—until the defeat of the Conservatives at the general election of that year. He continued as leader of the opposition until 1901, when he was succeeded by Mr. R. L. Borden, a lawyer of Halifax, who is now premier. From 1897 until the Laurier government committed itself to reciprocity in 1910, details rather than the principle of the national policy were the issues that divided the House of Commons. Save as regards the British preference the Conservatives welcomed and endorsed the protectionist and bounty legislation enacted by the Liberals from 1897 to 1907. They hailed the tariff of 1897 with joy as a deliberate and formal adoption by the Liberals of the fiscal policy to which the Conservatives had committed the Dominion in the days of Macdonald.

'There is to-day,' said Mr. George E. Foster, Minister of Finance in Conservative governments from 1888 to 1896, 'in this Parliament as between the two parties no difference upon the expediency of the principle of protection as the guiding principle of our fiscal system. The Liberals have adopted the Conservative principle in its entirety. It has been swallowed whole by the Liberal party. After eighteen years of virulent denunciation and abuse of that policy, they to-day embalm it upon the statute book of this country as their own.' *

It thus came about that for the first time since 1858 there was from 1897 to 1912, when the Liberals in opposition began to work back towards the Ottawa programme, no organised group in the House of Commons, and no political party in the constituencies, that was opposed to protection. The protectionists did not capture the constituencies in 1896. The Liberals were then elected on a programme that pledged them to the elimination of protection, and the continuous agitation of the farmers and grain-growers against the tariff —an agitation which in 1912 is still vigorous—is proof of the failure of the protectionists to capture the whole of the electorate at any time between 1896 and the election of 1911, when 625,000 votes were recorded for reciprocity, only 44,000 less than the votes by which the proposed agreement was defeated. But the Laurier government was captured by the protectionists in 1897; and thereafter protection tempered by the British preference—much curtailed between 1904 and 1907—was avowedly the guiding principle of the fiscal system, amended, extended and maintained by the Liberals.

Duties in the tariff, and bounties to the amount of nearly seventeen million dollars which were paid to half a dozen iron and steel companies in Nova Scotia, Quebec and Ontario between 1897 and 1911 were never too lavish for the Conservative opposition. Tariff and bounty legislation, moreover, at no time since 1879 glided more easily and smoothly through the House of Commons than during the fifteen years that the Laurier government was in power. The government was on pleasant terms with the tariff beneficiaries and the recipients of the iron and steel bounties; and when the national policy was in question the opposition was on equally good terms with the government and not inclined to friction. There was in fact an era of good feeling on the national policy in the House of Commons until 1911, when reciprocity established a new dividing-line. There was none of the bitterness

* H. of C. Debates, April 23, 1897.

and none of the persistent allegations of corruption in tariff-making that characterised the Liberal opposition to the national policy when the Conservatives were in power.

The only continuous issue arising out of the national policy while the Conservatives were in opposition was that which grew out of the preferential tariff. On this question there was no weakening or variation in the position of the Conservatives from 1897 to 1911. Their case, always frankly stated in and out of Parliament, was that the national policy, if it were to be consistent, demanded adequate protection for all Canadian industries alike against British, American or German competition; that no concessions should be made in Canadian tariffs to British manufacturers that jeopardised this principle; and that there ought not to be any concessions to Great Britain without concessions in favour of Canada in British tariffs. From 1901 to 1907 there were many movements on the part of Canadian manufacturers for more protection against British competition than was afforded under the preferential tariff; and as was consistent, these movements, notably those for higher duties in the woollen and cotton schedules, had the support of the opposition in the House of Commons.*

The preference was made gradual; and the full preference, which reduced duties on British imports by one-third, was operative only from 1900 to 1904. There was a serious curtailment of the preference on woollens in 1904, a curtailment which left British manufacturers with an advantage of only 5 per cent.; and at the revision of 1907, when a tariff with general, intermediate, and preferential rates was substituted for the old single-column tariff, numerous other curtailments were made at the instance of Canadian manufacturers who complained of British competition. But apart from these curtailments, the Laurier government to the end of its term adhered to the broad principle underlying the policy of preference which it adopted at the first revision of the tariff in 1897. This policy was then outlined by Mr. Fielding.†

'And last, but not least,' he said, in submitting the new tariff to the House of Commons, 'we give to the people the benefits of preferential trade with the mother country. This question of preferential trade has been mentioned in the House in times past. Leading public men have advocated preferential trade; but always annexing to their suggestions a demand with which it was well known England could not comply. All the advocates of preferential

* Cf. H. of C. Debates, April 13, 1909.

† H. of C. Debates, April 22, 1907.

trade, at all events all who have taken an active part in that movement, have assumed that as a first step England must consent to put a duty on corn. We know that England does not view that project with favour. We know that no more unpopular project can be offered the English people than to ask them to put a duty on breadstuffs. It may be, as time rolls on, and at an early day, they may change their views. It may be they may see it in their interest to make this distinction, and that they may offer some preferential rate to the grain of Canada. If they can be induced to do that by fair argument I have no doubt it will be a good thing for Canada. But why should we wait for England to take action? England has dealt generously with us in the past. England has given us a larger degree of liberty perhaps than is possessed by any other country on the face of the earth. She has given us liberty to tax her wares, even when she admits our goods free; and we have taxed them to an enormous degree. Why should we wait for England to do more? Somebody must make a move in this matter; and we propose that Canada shall lead the way.'

It is not too much to say that the policy of preferential trade with Great Britain that was entered upon in 1897 in the spirit of Mr. Fielding's speech was the most popular of all the policies of the Laurier government. It allayed to some extent the intense disappointment among the rank and file of the Liberals that followed the realisation that at the revision of 1897 the government had discarded the declaration on the tariff that had been embodied in the Ottawa programme. It was a policy that was afterwards adopted to a lesser degree by all the other oversea Dominions. It was a policy that at once gave Canada a new place in popular regard in England; and moreover it was a policy that strongly commended itself to nine-tenths of the people of the Dominion—to all save the extreme protectionists of the Conservative party in the House of Commons, and the protected manufacturers of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, who during the fifteen years that the Liberals were in power were as insistent for protection against British competition as for protection against competition from the United States. The preference was popular, and continues popular, despite the change of government in 1911, for two reasons. It affords a small though obviously unequal measure of relief from the burden of the general tariff; and its existence constitutes a much valued link of empire that is more in evidence than many of the links that existed before the preference was adopted. Most of the commendation of the preference was from the farmers. Not that they valued it more highly than other

Canadians; but chiefly because farmers are not directly connected with the protected manufacturing interests, and because, as has already been stated, farmers are the only general consumers who are organised.

The tariff commission of 1905–6 held its sessions at every large centre of population from Vancouver to Halifax; and at every session at which representatives of the farmers were in attendance there was commendation of the British preference, and appeals to the government to restore it to the uniform level at which it stood from 1900 to 1904, when the first inroad was made upon it at the instance of the woollen manufacturers of Ontario and Nova Scotia. No heed was then paid to these appeals. On the contrary, at the revision of 1907 there were many more curtailments; and the farmers renewed their agitation. So far as the Laurier government was concerned, this agitation culminated in December 1910, when eight hundred farmers from Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, representing farmers' organisations in these seven provinces, at the call of the Canadian Council of Agriculture waited on Sir Wilfrid Laurier at Ottawa, to ask for relief from the tariff.

By memorial and by speeches at this interview the farmers urged 'an immediate lowering of the duties on all British 'goods to one-half the rates charged under the general tariff 'whatever it may be; and such further gradual reduction of 'the remaining preferential tariff as will ensure the establish-'ment of complete free trade between Canada and the mother-'land within ten years.' It was conceded by the deputation that free trade between Canada and Great Britain must cause a loss to the revenue; but in the memorial to the government it was urged that the loss should be made up by direct taxation. The reciprocity agreement was then pending. The farmers' delegation strongly supported it, and urged that any trade advantage given the United States be also extended to Great Britain. 'Whatever we may be able to accomplish with our 'neighbours,' said Sir Wilfrid Laurier in reply, 'nothing that 'we do shall in any way impair or affect the British preference.' 'That,' the premier added, 'remains a cardinal principle of 'our policy.' *

It is not the purpose of this article to follow Canadian political history beyond the general election of 1911; but in concluding this brief sketch of the British preference, and of the attitude

* The Siege of Ottawa, 1; Report of Proceedings of Farmers' Delegation, Dec. 16, 1910, Sessional Paper No. 113, 38, 54, 56.

of the two political parties towards it, it may be added that in view of its popularity with the farmers, and in view of the fact that the approaching redistribution of electoral power will increase the representation of the grain-growing provinces from twenty-seven to forty-two, the preference is in no immediate danger from the Borden government. It will not be a cardinal principle of fiscal policy with the Conservatives as it was with the Liberals. Influences that were responsible for the curtailments of 1904 and 1907 may bring about further curtailments, for there is nothing in politics in any country comparable with the persistent pressure of protected interests for concessions from a complaisant government. But there are policies so reactionary that even the most protectionist governments hesitate before facing the dangers attending them; and the Borden government, from the first uncertain of its position by reason of the antagonism between its Quebec and its Ontario supporters on such highly contentious questions as the Ne Temere decree and the separate schools of the Roman Catholics, as these will be affected by the extension of the Manitoba boundaries, will hesitate long before it jeopardises its position in Canada, and the position that it naturally desires to hold in England, by materially interfering with the British preference.

The McKinley tariff of 1890 and the Dingley tariff of 1897, both enacted when the Republicans were in power at Washington, worked more havoc with Canadian exports to the United States than any American tariffs from the time the Elgin-Marcy treaty was abrogated in 1866. The first of these tariffs was especially disturbing to growers of hay and barley; and the second to the lumbermen of Ontario. All the provincial governments from Lake Superior to the Atlantic Ocean retaliated by amendments to the laws regulating the cutting of lumber of crown lands. They imposed new conditions which compelled Americans importing logs and pulp wood from the Dominion to establish mills in the provinces from which before the enactment of the Dingley tariff they were drawing their raw material; and an adroitly framed clause in the Dingley act, dictated by the Michigan lumber interests, was frustrated by the action of the legislatures of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. It had been realised at Washington that the Dominion government might retaliate, and the lumber schedule of the Dingley tariff was so framed as to penalise Canadian exports if the Dominion took any step in that direction. Power to impose an export duty on logs by orders-in-council was given by Parliament to the Dominion government;

but the action of Ontario made the exercise of this power unnecessary, and not until 1903 was the Dominion involved in a war of tariffs.

The tariff war that continued from 1903 until 1910 was with Germany, and arose out of the tariff concessions to Great Britain. At the time the preference was enacted—April, 1897—Canada was bound by a treaty between Great Britain and Germany under which exports to Germany from Canada had favoured-nation treatment, and German goods imported into Canada could not be charged higher customs duties than were charged on imports from Great Britain. As soon as the preference went into effect Germany claimed the lower rates. The Ottawa government protested; but it was determined in London that this claim must be conceded. 'It accordingly 'followed,' Mr. Fielding told the House of Commons on April 16, 1903, 'that if we gave the preferential rate to Germany, 'then the favoured-nation treaties with other nations came in, 'and we had to give the preferential rate to other countries 'as well. So that practically the preference to the mother 'country was for the moment cancelled.' * But while the Imperial government was compelled to take the position that the preferential rate must be conceded to Germany, it promptly denounced the treaty at the instance of the Dominion government. The treaty came to an end in July 1898, and a new provisional treaty was negotiated with Germany, from which Canada was excluded. Canada protested on the ground that the preference was purely a domestic policy—a ground that was accepted without any reference of the matter to the Dominion by Congress and by President Taft when the Payne-Aldrich tariff was enacted in 1909. The negotiations with Germany were prolonged, and in their final stages they were between the Dominion ministers—Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Mr. Fielding and Mr. Paterson—and the German consul in Montreal. They were, however, without avail. Canadian exports to Germany were made dutiable at much higher rates than the general tariff; and in 1903 there was retaliatory legislation at Ottawa.

Germany was not named in the clause that was added to the tariff; but from the end of September 1903 to February 1910 all dutiable imports from Germany paid a surtax of thirty-three and a third per cent. in excess of the duties in the general tariff. Soon after the tariff war had begun Mr. Fielding was asked in the House of Commons 'Who pays this surtax?'

* H. of C. Debates, April 16, 1903.

'Just at the present moment,' answered the Minister of Finance, 'it would be more convenient to assume that the consumer 'does not pay the duty.' * In the winter of 1905–6, however, when the Tariff Commission, of which Mr. Fielding was the chairman, was at Montreal, Toronto and Quebec, there was proof that the consumer paid the surtax, and that the makers-up of certain lines of textiles had been much inconvenienced by the tariff war; and in 1910, when, after much negotiation, again managed by Dominion ministers and the German consul at Montreal, the war was nearing an end, the manufacturers of knitted woollen goods were nervous at being again protected from German competition only by the duties of the general tariff. 'Has the honourable gentleman taken into consideration the fact,' asked a member of the opposition of Mr. Fielding, 'that 'there are manufacturing interests in this country that have been 'built up under this surtax, and that they require some different 'treatment now that it is to come to an end?' Mr. Fielding's answer was that the surtax was a war measure, and 'I am 'quite sure,' he continued, 'that any manufacturer who has 'given any attention to the question must have been aware that 'just so soon as Germany receded from what we regarded as 'her unjustifiable position, we should be free to remove the 'surtax, retaining as we now do the general tariff, which is 'the basis on which all manufacturing establishments have been 'created in recent years.' †

The tariff war was an experience from which only the extreme protectionists derived any satisfaction. The Liberals would have made much political capital out of this episode in tariff-making in the days of their opposition to the national policy; for the burden of the surtax fell on fishermen and men who go in winter to the lumber camps, and on men and women who are compelled to buy the cheaper kinds of woollen goods. Both countries lost much trade; and after seven years of tariff war Germany was ready to concede her conventional tariff on a specified list of articles exported by Canada in return for the abolition of the surtax—to obtain in 1910 less than Canada had been prepared to concede in the negotiations of 1898–1903. ‡

Canada has had a commercial convention with France since 1893. A supplementary convention was agreed upon at Paris in January 1907; but owing to delay due to amendments

* H. of C. Debates, Oct. 22, 1903.
† H. of C. Debates, Feb. 16, 1910.
‡ Cf. H. of C. Debates, Feb. 16, 1910.

by the French Senate it was November 1909 before the convention was confirmed by Parliament at Ottawa. Under the new agreement the advantage of the French minimum tariff was conceded to 152 classes of Canadian exports; and in respect of ninety-eight articles of French export Canada conceded her minimum tariff, and also made special concessions to France in regard to preserved vegetables, canned fish, still wines, books in French, medicinal preparations, olive oil, lace and embroideries, silks and velvets, and made-up silk goods. No Canadian manufacturing industry was jeopardised by these concessions; while the French concessions were of greatest value to Canada as regards agricultural machinery and wood pulp.

Trade between the two countries is small; for in no year prior to the new convention did Canadian imports from France exceed eight million dollars; * and when the convention was before the House of Commons, the opposition was chiefly concerned as to how these trade conventions might affect trade relations with Great Britain, when Great Britain should be ready to make concessions in her tariff for Canada. 'It 'is hoped by a great many people in this country and throughout 'the Empire,' said Mr. Borden, in a speech in which he had urged that little advantage had accrued to Canada from the convention of 1893, 'that we may have some day in the 'not too distant future a system of mutual preferences; and 'I doubt the wisdom of complicating our tariff by treaty 'provisions which would prevent Canada from entering into 'a system of such mutual trade preferences.' 'It is possible,' was Sir Wilfrid Laurier's reply, 'to have preferential arrange-'ments with Great Britain without injuring our relations with 'other countries.' †

Of much more significance than this supplementary convention with France was the tariff arrangement that was made in 1910 with the United States, for it was made at the instance of President Taft, the first American President to approach Canada with a view to concessions in a Canadian tariff. From 1848 to 1897 all the overtures for better trade relations between Canada and the United States were either from the government of the united provinces or the government of the Dominion; and the only result of these overtures was the Elgin-Marcy reciprocity treaty that was in force from 1854 to 1866. From confederation to 1897, when the joint high commission was

* Cf. Imports from France, H. of C. Debates, Jan. 13, 1908.

† H. of C. Debates, Nov. 30, 1909.

constituted, all overtures were unavailing; and with the failure in 1897 Sir Wilfrid Laurier announced that there would be no more pilgrimages to Washington.

The overtures from Mr. Taft were made necessary by a section in the Payne-Aldrich tariff act which imposed an additional duty of 25 per cent. ad valorem on imports from any country which in its tariff unduly discriminated against the products of the United States.* The Washington government did not raise the question of the British preference. 'It recognised,' said Mr. Fielding, 'that the preference is a 'matter of family arrangement within the British Empire.' † But the question arose as to what concessions Canada was prepared to make to come under the minimum tariff; and on Mr. Secretary Knox intimating to Mr. Bryce that the United States government desired to open negotiations, the British Ambassador informed him that the best way to deal with the matter was by direct negotiation with the government at Ottawa.

Two commissioners representing Mr. Taft accordingly went to Ottawa, where they were in conference with Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. Fielding. These commissioners reported to Mr. Taft; and subsequently the President and Mr. Fielding were in conference at Albany, when Mr. Taft suggested that if certain concessions were made in the Canadian tariff the United States would grant Canada the minimum duties in the Payne-Aldrich tariff.‡ All through the negotiations the Canadian position was (1) that the concessions should not be numerous—that Canada could not concede to the United States what she had conceded to France; and (2) that the concessions should not place any Canadian industries at a disadvantage from American competition. Ultimately reductions from the general tariff of the Dominion, only in one instance exceeding 2½ per cent., were made on thirteen articles—dates, figs, prunes, almonds, walnuts, photographs, chromos, soap, perfumery, common china, granite ware, watch actions and fancy leathers—and in March 1910 the House of Commons was asked to pass a bill making these changes in the tariff.

The section in the United States tariff which led to these negotiations was characteristic of the ethics that governed

---

* Cf. Tariff Act of 1909, Sec. 2.

† H. of C. Debates, March 30, 1910.

‡ Cf. Speech by Mr. Paterson, Minister of Customs, H. of C. Debates, May 3, 1910.

the enactment of the clause in the Dingley tariff aimed at Canada; for the section was intended to be used as a weapon with which to force from various countries tariff concessions to the United States without granting concessions in return.* In regard to Canada it placed President Taft in a position of extreme difficulty; for failing an arrangement with the Dominion such as was ultimately brought about, the maximum duties would have automatically come into effect against Canada on April 1, 1910, and there must soon have been an outcry from American importers and railway companies whose trade and traffic would have been disorganised by this sudden and large increase in the duties. This was realised at Ottawa, where it was understood that President Taft would be compelled to accept any concessions, no matter how small, that would enable him to grant to Canada the minimum tariff, and obviate the application by Canada of the surtax which so far had been applied only against Germany.

From the Conservative benches of the House of Commons there were complaints that in making any concessions Canada had shown the white feather; and there was a suggestion that the United States Steel Corporation, with a trade of sixty million dollars a year with Canada, would have been vigilant at Washington against any tariff war. Mr. Borden raised the same objection that he had made to the supplementary convention with France.

'We ought not,' he said, 'to place ourselves by these negotiations in any position which would hamper our future fiscal relations with any country in the world; and especially we ought not to enter into any such negotiations as would prevent the consummation of that great ideal which Mr. Chamberlain presented to the people of the British Empire some few years ago.' †

The most complete answer to objections against concessions to the United States was from Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

'I am asked,' said the premier, 'what do we get from these concessions? I answer, we get peace and good relations with our neighbours; and I ask is not peace and good commercial relations with our neighbour worth all the feathers and artificial flowers in creation? We were in this position, if we had been stiff with

* 'Using the maximum schedule as a club, just as the framers of the provision intended that it should be used, the President has been able to obtain lower rates of duty for numerous exports to several countries than could otherwise have been obtained.'—*Boston Herald*, March 27, 1910.

† H. of C. Debates, May 3, 1910.

the United States they might have chosen to be stiff with us. Canada numbers seven millions, while Americans are ninety millions. We have surrendered nothing. We have made concessions that amount to nothing, so far as I can see; and for these we have the goodwill of that great nation.*

The reciprocity agreement with the United States grew out of the tariff negotiations of 1910, and again not at the instance of Canada but at that of Mr. Taft. Every Canadian government from 1868 to 1911, Conservative and Liberal, was eager for reciprocity and had made overtures to secure it. After the failure of the joint high commission of 1897 the Laurier government ceased its efforts; but in 1910 the overtures, to the surprise of Canada, came from Washington. The Laurier government, acting in harmony with the policy of Macdonald, who first embarked the Dominion on the national policy, responded to these overtures. The agreement with President Taft was for concurrent legislation, as distinct from a treaty, leaving each country free at any time to repeal it. President Taft, with the aid of the Democrats in the House and Senate, carried the necessary legislation at Washington, and had the Laurier government been able to fulfil its part of the agreement Canada would have secured trade relations with the United States in nearly every respect as good, and in some respects better, than those of the greatly valued Elgin-Marcy treaty.

Manufacturers of agricultural machinery and of motor cars at Toronto, Hamilton, and Brantford would have had to forego a fraction of the generous protection they have so long enjoyed. The great companies owning mines in Nova Scotia would have been deprived of less than one-seventh of the protection that has been afforded the coal industry for thirty-two years. Otherwise by the reciprocity agreement there were no inroads on protection to Canadian industries; for Mr. Fielding, by whom the agreement was negotiated, was avowedly protectionist. There were no complaints from Canadian manufacturers that their protection was sacrificed by the agreement; but its general principle was regarded as an inroad on the national policy, and as a dangerous concession to the low tariff movement which was then agitating the prairie provinces. Manufacturers who had been active in the attack on the British preference began to be nervous about the British connexion and apprehensive of the Americanisation of Canada. They insisted that the home market, plus the British market,

* H. of C. Debates, March 30, 1910.

was ample for the farmers ; and it was further contended that however desirable reciprocity might have been in the days of Macdonald, a new Canada had come into existence for which the national policy was all-sufficient.

The Conservatives in the House of Commons were persistent in their opposition, and, as there is no closure at Ottawa, the government was helpless against an opposition determined on forcing a dissolution. There was nothing in the principles or traditions of the Conservative party to warn the Laurier government of the opposition that reciprocity encountered. The agreement was submitted to Parliament in January. The general election did not come until September, when all the potent influences which had impelled the Laurier government to abandon the fiscal principles of the Liberal party, and that had been its support at the general elections of 1900, 1904, and 1908, were transferred to the Conservatives. With these influences against it the Laurier government was defeated ; and an end was thereby made to its only sustained effort to act in accordance with the tariff principles of the Liberal convention of 1893.

Next in importance to the fiscal policy of the Laurier government comes its railway legislation—its creation of the Board of Railway Commissioners in 1903, and its legislation for the building of the second transcontinental railway, the Grand Trunk Pacific, from the junction of the St. John and Halifax divisions of the Intercolonial railway at Moncton, New Brunswick, to Prince Rupert on the coast of British Columbia.

Before the railway commission was created some of the various and important duties it is now discharging were divided between the railway committee, a sub-committee of the cabinet, and the governor-in-council. The railway committee, that in one form or another had existed since 1851, was abolished by the act of 1903, and a commission with large and varied powers, and as independent of the cabinet as the judiciary, was created to take its place. England has had a railway commission since 1873. At Washington there has been an interstate commerce commission since 1887. The powers of the English commission were greatly extended in 1888, but when the late Mr. A. G. Blair, first minister of railways in the Laurier government, introduced the bill of 1903, he emphasised the fact that the Dominion commission was to be invested with larger powers and more executive authority than were then possessed by railway commissions in any country where they were established. 'We have endeavoured,' added Mr. Blair, 'in a proper way to protect the rights of the

'railway companies, but we have assumed absolute and complete 'control with regard to what the rates shall be.' *

By other legislation between 1903 and 1909 the powers of the commission were extended, and telegraph and telephone companies, parcel-carrying companies associated with the railway companies, and companies developing electric power under leases from the crown, and transmitting and selling electric power, were brought within its jurisdiction. Three members are of the commission, which is a court of record. The commissioners are judges of both fact and law, a majority of the board decides, and as respects the enforcement of its orders the board has the powers and privileges of a superior court. The board is migratory, and in the course of a year it holds seventy or eighty public sittings in seven or eight provinces and at cities as wide apart as Halifax and Victoria. One of its characteristics is the simplicity and inexpensiveness of its procedure. It is not strict in requiring applicants, and particularly illiterate persons, to conform to its rules, but often calls upon a railway company, on account of a mere letter or informal complaint, to state its position and to remedy a grievance thus informally complained of.

In its political aspects the legislation of 1904 and 1905 for the second transcontinental railway was remarkable for the sharp line of division between the government and the Conservative opposition as to the policy on which this great undertaking should be carried out. The government policy was that of contract with the Grand Trunk Pacific company, a company organised by the Grand Trunk Railway company, under which the government undertook to build the line from Moncton to Winnipeg, and lease it to the railway company, and the company, with the aid of bonds guaranteed by the government, undertook to build the line from Winnipeg to the Pacific coast. The project of a second railway between the great lakes and the Pacific coast originated with the Grand Trunk company, which has long had a network of lines in Quebec and Ontario, with its main lines extending from Levis to Windsor on the Detroit river, but which until work on the new transcontinental line was begun had no line reaching further westward than North Bay, Ontario, an important divisional centre on the main line of the Canadian Pacific from Montreal to Vancouver.

The Grand Trunk railway naturally desired access to the grain-growing provinces in order to be able to carry a share

* H. of C. Debates, March 30, 1903.

of the constantly increasing crops of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta either westward to the Pacific coast, or eastward to Fort William or Port Arthur, at the head of lake navigation, whence grain is shipped to the ports on Georgian Bay, and thence by rail to Montreal for shipment to England. The Grand Trunk company only desired to build from North Bay to the Pacific coast. But the government policy was that the new transcontinental railway should also serve Ontario, Quebec, and the maritime provinces. The opposition in the House of Commons contended that with the Intercolonial railway connecting the maritime provinces with Montreal there was no need for a second line to the maritime provinces. Its contention was that the Intercolonial should be extended from Montreal to North Bay, to form the eastern division, and that the new railway should be built, owned, and operated, like the Intercolonial, by the Dominion government.

There was much discussion of these opposing policies when the bill incorporating the Grand Trunk Pacific railway company in 1903 and the government bills of 1904 and 1905 were before the House of Commons. In view of the fact that Mr. Borden is now premier, some significance attaches to speeches that he made on the second of the government bills—a bill varying the terms with the Grand Trunk Pacific company, in which he urged the construction of a government-owned railway. 'If 'we adopted this policy,' said the leader of the opposition, 'we 'would own a national transcontinental railway in the true 'sense of the term. We would absolutely control rates, and 'we would absolutely ensure transportation for our products 'through our own territory and from our own sea-ports.' * At a later stage of the bill Mr. Borden expressed his conviction that by the time the transcontinental could be completed, if it were built and owned by the government,

'the sentiment of the people of Canada would have reached the conclusion that the road constructed by the people should not only be owned but operated by them. . . . If it is the will of the people of Canada as declared by their voice at the next general election that another railway from ocean to ocean shall be built, owned and controlled by the people of Canada, the Conservative party, if returned to power, is prepared, in accordance with the will of the people so expressed, to place on the statute book such legislation as will enable that result to be accomplished with the least possible delay.' †

---

* H. of C. Debates, April 5. 1905.
† Ibid. May 26, 1905.

Quite early in the controversy Sir Richard Cartwright had declared that the existing system of government was one 'which offers no end of difficulties in the way of the successful 'operation of railways' *; and when Mr. Borden moved his amendment in favour of government ownership and operation—an amendment for which fifty-nine members voted—Mr. Fielding was the only member of the government who answered the leader of the opposition. He dismissed Mr. Borden's case by merely stating that the government was opposed to government ownership and operation of railways. Then he added 'it is a very big question, and one upon which new lines of 'policy and new parties might be formed,' a remark not without significance in view of the trend of political thought among the grain-growers of the prairie provinces,† and the sympathy expressed by Mr. Borden when he was in the west on the eve of the general election of 1911, with the demand for government-owned elevators and a government railway to Hudson's Bay.

The Grand Trunk Pacific line, on which construction work was begun in 1905, is in two divisions—the eastern and the western. The eastern division, which extends from Moncton to Winnipeg and crosses the St. Lawrence a few miles above the city of Quebec, is being built by the government, under the supervision of the commissioners of the transcontinental railway. It is 1804 miles long. In October 1911, when the Laurier government went out of office, approximately 1244 miles had been laid with rails; 238 miles of sidings were also complete; and the section, 245 miles long, between Winnipeg and the junction with the G.T.P. branch line to Fort William, Ontario, was being worked by the company in connexion with its western line from Winnipeg to Edmonton.‡ On completion of the eastern division the company, in accordance with the terms of the Act of 1905, will lease it from the government for fifty years. For the first seven years the company, which furnishes all the rolling-stock, is to pay only working expenditures. For the next forty-three years it is to pay a rental equal to three per cent. on the cost of construction of the division.

The western division from Winnipeg to Prince Rupert—of

---

* H. of C. Debates, Aug. 25, 1903.

† Cf. Report of Farmers' Delegation, Dec. 16, 1910, pp. 9–14, 26–29, 29–31.

‡ From data furnished by Mr. E. P. Ryan, Secretary, Commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway, Jan. 31, 1912.

which the main line is 3600 miles long, with branch lines aggregating 6149 miles—is being constructed by the railway company, under an agreement with the government by which the government guarantees for fifty years the principal and interest of three-quarters of the cost of construction. This division has its prairie and its mountain sections. On the prairie section there is a provision that three-quarters of the cost of construction shall not exceed $13,000 a mile. There is no limitation of the cost of the much more difficult mountain section. Parts of the western division were in service in 1910, and when the Laurier government came to the end of its term, a little over two thousand miles of this division was completed.* The building of this second transcontinental railway—especially of the western division—has opened out an enormous area of new territory ; it has greatly facilitated settlement in the prairie provinces ; and its special value to the most western provinces of the Dominion will be much increased with the opening of the Panama Canal.

For many years during the period from 1878 to 1896, when the Liberals were in opposition, they advocated in and out of Parliament a reform of the Senate. At the Ottawa convention it was declared that—

> 'The present constitution of the Senate is inconsistent with the federal principle in our system of government, and is in other respects defective, as it makes the Senate independent of the people and uncontrolled by the public opinion of the country, and should be so amended as to bring it in harmony with the principles of popular government.'†

At the time of the change of government in July 1896 there were 83 members of the Senate, and as no Liberals had been appointed since 1878 the Conservatives numbered 70 and the Liberals 13. From 1896 to 1911 not more than three or four minor government bills were rejected by the Senate, and even in the early years of the Laurier government it was little inconvenienced by the fact that there was a Conservative majority there. That there was no friction in these years perhaps accounts for the fact that the government completely ignored the old attitude of the Liberals towards the Senate, and made no movement for its reform. It followed the example of the Conservative government in filling vacancies. Only

* Cf. R. S. Logan, 'Synoptical History of the Grand Trunk System of Railways,' pp. 27, 28.

† Official Report of the Liberal Convention, 1893, p. 134.

Liberals were appointed ; and when the Laurier government came to an end, of the 87 members of the Senate 65 were Liberals and 22 were of the Conservative party.

While there was no attempt to reform the Senate the Laurier government was responsible for two remarkable constitutional innovations. In 1898 there was a plébiscite on the prohibition question ; and in 1905 a law was enacted under which a salary of $7000 has since been paid to the leader of the opposition in the House of Commons.

Prohibition was one of the questions that engaged the attention of the Liberal convention, when a resolution was carried enlarging on the 'admittedly great evils of intemper-'ance,' and declaring that it was desirable that 'the mind 'of the people should be clearly ascertained on the question 'of prohibition by means of a Dominion plébiscite.'* A bill to enable a plébiscite to be taken was introduced by Mr. S. Fisher, minister of agriculture, in the session of 1898. It was a government measure. Under its provisions every man qualified to vote for member of the House of Commons was entitled to vote at the plébiscite ; and the duty of declaring the result in each electoral district was thrown upon the clerk of the crown in Chancery. A campaign preceded the plébiscite in many of the constituencies, in which several members of the cabinet made speeches in support of prohibition, and several made speeches urging electors to vote against it. There were at this time 1,223,849 names on the Dominion electoral rolls. Of these 278,478 voted in the affirmative on the question 'Are you in favour of the passing of an act 'prohibiting the importation, manufacture, or sale of spirits, 'wine, ale, beer, cider, and all other alcoholic liquors as 'beverages ?' The negative vote was 264,571. The contest was between the temperance societies and the churches on the one side, and the brewers, distillers, and saloon keepers on the other, with the opposition to prohibition strongest in Montreal, Quebec, and the other larger towns in the French province. Both these opposing interests worked hard 'to 'get out the vote' ; but 56 per cent. of the electors did not trouble to go to the polls. There was no provision in the act compelling legislation in accordance with the vote. The government did not regard the majority as sufficient to warrant it in introducing a prohibition bill ; and thereafter prohibition ceased to be an issue in Dominion politics.

Indemnity is the word that has always been used at Ottawa

* Official Report of the Liberal Convention, 1893, p. 135.

to describe the payment to members of the House and the Senate. For some years before 1905 it was at the rate of $1500 a session. In 1905, however, there was a strictly non-partisan movement for an increase—a movement which took the form of a round robin to the government signed by most members on both sides of the House. The government was in an accommodating mood. It at once introduced and carried legislation increasing the indemnity to $2500, and increasing the salary of the Prime Minister from $8000 to $12,000. There was also embodied in the bill a clause authorising the payment of an additional sessional allowance of $7000 'to the member occupying the recognised position 'of leader of the opposition in the House of Commons.' The government would not concede that it was making a departure from the British system of constitutional government in thus providing a salary for the leader of his Majesty's opposition.

'I contend, on the contrary,' said Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 'that we are simply coming to a new stage in the development of constitutional government. The leader of the opposition under our system is just as much a part of the constitutional system as the Prime Minister . . . and I have thought for a long time that it is not fair that the person who holds the position of leader of the opposition should be called upon to give his services to the country without any remuneration. Either his public duties must suffer, or his private duties must suffer; and under the circumstances I think the country is rich enough to pay the gentleman who for the time being is discharging the important functions entrusted to him.' *

In the same session a bill was passed which provided that 'every member of the King's Privy Council for Canada who 'has served as prime minister or as cabinet minister and head 'of a department for five consecutive years' should receive an annuity equal to one-half the salary attaching to his office at the time of his retirement.† There was a great outcry all over the Dominion against this legislation. As it was non-partisan it was defended by the leaders of both political parties. 'Before this legislation,' said Mr. Borden at Toronto, 'an 'opposition leader had either to be a rich man or to accept gifts 'from his party and to be under obligation to its wealthy 'members, or to sacrifice his personal interests and his family's 'welfare. The leader of the opposition under the new

* H. of C. Debates, July 17, 1905.
† 4–5 Ed. VII. c. 30.

'arrangement is paid by the country, not by the government '—just as the judges are—and there is no more reason in his 'case than in theirs for any charge of dependence or subserviency.' * The popular outcry was, however, so continuous that the government deemed it expedient to make some concession; and in 1906 the annuities act was repealed. In asking the House to pass the repealing bill Mr. Fielding conceded that the act of 1905 was obviously an unpopular measure—one that must be repealed because it was in advance of public opinion. Mr. Foster, who was then associated with Mr. Borden in the leadership of the opposition, and who is now minister of trade and commerce, regretted this action of the government, because 'the road up to cabinet office was long, hard, and 'thorny,' and because 'the man who does not intend to be 'mean cannot pass through this capital city of Ottawa on 'the salary of a cabinet minister.' †

An innovation of a commendable character was made when the redistribution bill of 1903 was going through the House of Commons. The Liberals in opposition had complained of gerrymandering at the redistribution that followed the census of 1891—that the constituencies had been arranged to 'secure to the party now in power a strength out of all 'proportion greater than the number of electors supporting 'them would warrant.' ‡ To secure a redistribution in 1903 free from the blemishes in the redistribution acts of 1882 and 1892, Sir Wilfrid Laurier proposed the appointment of a small committee representing both sides of the House of Commons. The committee was named and sat continuously from June 18 to July 23. Three of its members were from the government side of the House and two from the opposition. Minutes of its proceedings showed that in the case of 165 constituencies out of a total of 214, the decisions of the committee were unanimous; and the result of this new method of procedure was a redistribution act which appears to have eliminated the gerrymander as a source of contention in Dominion politics.§

The legislation of 1905 necessary to give provincial autonomy to Alberta and Saskatchewan was the most contentious of the constitutional measures of the Laurier government. The northwest territories, out of which these two new provinces

* Speech at Toronto, Dec. 14, 1905.
† H. of C. Debates, June 29, 1906.
‡ Official Report of Liberal Convention of 1893, p. 129.
§ H. of C. Debates, Jan. 2, March 31, and Sept. 9, 1903.

were carved, had been represented in Parliament since 1886. Since 1888 there had been a local legislature for the territories of which Regina was the capital; and from 1897 there had existed, as in provinces with full autonomy, an executive council that was responsible to the local legislature. The demand from the territories for full provincial powers with control over education and crown lands was made in 1902. The English-speaking inhabitants desired that the provincial legislatures should have full control over education; that they should not be tied in any degree in this matter by clauses in autonomy acts, but that the school question should be regarded as a local matter and be determined upon by those directly interested. Separate schools in Quebec and Ontario are older than confederation. They date back to the days of the united provinces; and the Roman Catholics in Quebec and Ontario have always been tenacious of the rights they enjoy under the separate school system. In 1875, when the Liberal administration of which Mackenzie was premier was in power, there was school legislation for the northwest territories under which a majority of ratepayers in any local government area might establish such schools as they thought fit and assess themselves for the maintenance of such schools. In 1905 there were not more than ten or twelve of these separate schools; but the Laurier government insisted that the rights of the minority must be protected in the autonomy bills. With regard to crown lands, the government refused to comply with the demand of the people of the new provinces on the ground that provincial control would seriously embarrass the immigration policy of the Dominion government.*

There was as much commotion all over the Dominion on the schools question in this autonomy legislation as there had been over the Manitoba schools question in 1895–96. One member of the ministry—Mr. Clifford Sifton, who had been minister of the interior since 1896—resigned. Two other members—Messrs. Fielding and Oliver—both expressed in the House of Commons their dislike of separate schools.† At one time it appeared as though there would be a break-up of the administration. But Sir Wilfrid Laurier stood firm. He unequivocally supported 'a system of schools wherein 'after secular matters have been attended to the tenets of 'the religion of Christ, even with the divisions which exist 'among His followers, are allowed to be taught;' ‡ and after

* H. of C. Debates, Feb. 21, 1905.

† Ibid. May 3, 1905. ‡ H. of C. Debates, Feb. 21, 1905.

ten weeks of agitation in and out of Parliament the bills as framed by the government became law. The Conservatives opposed the government policies both as to crown lands and separate schools. Their attitude on these questions is of significance to-day when all three prairie provinces are again insisting on the control of the crown lands within their borders, and when Manitoba has been conceded a large increase in its area, a question which for the third time since 1895 raises the disturbing issue of the position of the schools of the Roman Catholic Church in the newer provinces of the Dominion.

From confederation to 1910 the Dominion spent $15,000,000 on immigration. At no time in these forty-three years was immigration propaganda conducted with more vigour or more lavish expense than during the fifteen years of the late Liberal administration, when Mr. Clifford Sifton and Mr. Frank Oliver, both from the west, were successively in charge of the department of the interior. Nearly eight and a half million dollars —more than half the aggregate expenditure since confederation —were spent on this propaganda from 1896 to 1910. The full effect of this new policy of stimulating immigration from the United States and continental Europe as well as from the British Isles, was not apparent until the turn of the century. In no year from 1896 to 1901 did the number of immigrants reach fifty thousand. The number in 1902 was 67,379. Then the stream began to reach the Dominion in full flood. It poured in from more than forty countries, not counting England, Scotland, and Ireland. The number of immigrants reached its highest mark in 1910, when it was 208,000; and the average from 1902 to 1910 was a little over 142,000 a year. In these years Canada was drawing its immigrants from much the same countries as have long supplied the United States; and with the variety and volume of the new immigration Canada was compelled to follow the example of the United States, and amend its immigration code to exclude undesirables.

A Dominion immigration law was enacted as far back as 1886. Practically a new code was created by the legislation of 1906 and 1907—legislation against which there were many protests from emigration societies in England, but which was persisted in by the government. Much of the old code was permissive. The new code is in general mandatory. It excludes undesirables, defectives, and persons likely to become a public charge, and gives power to the immigration authorities to deport criminals or paupers at any

time within two years of their arrival in Canada. Power is also given to the governor-in-council to prohibit by proclamation the landing of any specified class of immigrants —a power that was used at the time of the commercial depression in 1907–8, and has since been used in winter to prohibit the landing of immigrants who are not going direct to work already secured, or who are not provided with a specified amount of money. The new code is almost as drastic as the code of the United States, from which it chiefly differs in not excluding contract labour coming from Great Britain or European countries. Contract labour from the United States can be excluded under an earlier act.

The United States has excluded Chinese immigration since 1884. Canada since 1885 has imposed taxes to restrict it. From 1885 to 1900 the tax was fifty dollars. From 1900 to 1903 it was one hundred dollars. Then, after much conflict with the government of British Columbia, it was increased to five hundred dollars. About this time feeling on the Pacific coast was as strong against the Japanese as against the Chinese, and an arrangement was made between the Dominion and Japan by which Japan undertook, as Sir Wilfrid Laurier informed the House of Commons when he introduced the immigration bill of 1903, ' not only to restrict but absolutely ' to prevent Japanese immigration ' to Canada by withholding passports.*

Coolie immigration from India, which began about 1900, has aroused much hostility in British Columbia, where there are now four thousand Sikhs. It has been restricted since 1908 by an order-in-council imposing a landing tax of two hundred dollars, and one of the first deputations to the Borden government was from the Sikhs in British Columbia, with a memorial reminding the premier that ' our common Sovereigns, ' their Majesties, have solemnly promised all subjects of the ' Empire, regardless of race, equality of treatment,' and asking that the restriction of 1908 be removed.†

The policy of the government in regard to the immigration of Asiatics was in the interest of labour on the Pacific coast. In the interest of labour in general the government in 1900, acting on a resolution of the House of Commons, began to embody fair wages clauses in all contracts for public works and for supplies for the various government departments ; and in 1907 it carried through Parliament the industrial

* H. of C. Debates, March 20, 1903.

† The Aryan, I., No. 5, Vancouver, December 1911.

disputes investigation act. This measure, now known far beyond the confines of the Dominion as the Lemieux act, makes strikes and lock-outs in the coal-mining industry and in railways and other public utilities illegal until after an investigation has been made into the causes of the dispute and every reasonable effort has been made by a board organised under the act to bring about an agreement. The act came into effect in March 1907. From then until the end of September 1911 one hundred and nineteen investigations had been made under its provisions, and in one hundred and eight of these cases strikes had been averted.

The last of the great measures of the Laurier government was the act of the session of 1910 for the creation of the Dominion navy. It provided for a permanent and volunteer naval force, the control of the navy by the department of marine and fisheries; the creation of the office of director of navy service; and committed the Dominion to the immediate building of four cruisers of the Bristol class, one of the Boadicea class, and six torpedo-boat destroyers. In introducing the bill Sir Wilfrid Laurier explained the relations which would exist between the Dominion and the British navy.

'The Act provides,' he said, 'that any time when the governor-general-in-council deems it advisable, in case of invasion, war, or insurrection, the force may be called into active service. There is also an important provision, to which I at once call the attention of the House, that while the naval force is to be under the control of the Canadian government, in case of emergency the governor-in-council may place at the disposal of his Majesty for general service in his Royal Navy the naval service or any part thereof and any ships or vessels of the naval service and any officers or men serving on these vessels, or any officers or men of the naval service. There is a subsequent provision that if such action is taken by the governor-in-council at a time when parliament is not sitting, parliament shall be immediately called.'

The policy of the Conservative opposition—a policy from which Mr. F. D. Monk, now minister of public works in the Borden government, and other of the Conservative members from Quebec dissented, was thus expressed by Mr. Borden:

'Go on with your naval service. Proceed cautiously and surely. Lay your proposals before the people and give them if necessary opportunity to be heard; but do not forget that we are confronted with an emergency which may rend this Empire asunder before this proposed navy is worthy of the name. In the face of such a situation immediate, vigorous, earnest action is necessary. We have no Dreadnought ready; we have no fleet unit at hand. But we

have the resources, and I trust the patriotism, to provide a fleet unit, or at least a Dreadnought, without one moment's unnecessary delay. Or—and in my opinion this would be the better course—we can place the equivalent in cash at the disposal of the Admiralty to be used for naval defence under such conditions as we prescribe.' *

There was prolonged debate in the House of Commons before the bill was carried, and much opposition in the province of Quebec. By April 20, however, it had passed all its stages in the Commons. There was little delay in the Senate; and by October 1910 the Dominion was in possession of the first vessels of the new fleet—the Niobe and the Rainbow—bought from the Admiralty. In the session of 1911 there was a vote of $3,002,600 for the navy, and when the Laurier government went out of office tenders had been received from British and Canadian builders for the construction in shipyards in Canada of four cruisers and six destroyers. Action on these tenders was postponed by the Borden government, and on March 4, 1912, it was announced in Parliament that the Act of 1910 would be repealed.

A volume could be written on the material developement of the Dominion during the fifteen years of the Laurier régime —a period that embraced the terms of three governors-general, the Earl of Aberdeen, the Earl of Minto, and Earl Grey. In railway building it was a period of unexampled and continuous activity. It was a period of great developement of manufacturing in Ontario, Quebec, and Nova Scotia. There was, in particular, a great expansion of the iron and steel industry in Ontario and Nova Scotia, and in the coal industry of Nova Scotia and Alberta, and the establishment of a quite new industry in steel shipbuilding at Toronto and Collingwood and other Ontario ports on the great lakes. But the greatest developement of all—the developement on which much of the prosperity of the manufacturing industries of Ontario, Quebec, and Nova Scotia was chiefly dependent—was beyond the great lakes, and was directly due to the filling up of the grain-growing provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta.

None of these developements can be followed here in detail. All that is practicable is to cite a few statistics from which the growth in population and the material developement of the Dominion between 1896 and 1911 can be estimated. In 1891 the population was 4,830,000; in 1901 it was 5,370,000; in 1911 it was 7,081,000. During the last decade the greatest increase in population was in the prairie provinces. The

* H. of C. Debates, Jan. 12, 1910.

population of Alberta increased from 73,000 in 1901 to 372,000 in 1911 ; that of Manitoba from 255,000 to 454,000 ; and that of Saskatchewan from 91,000 to 453,000. In 1896 there were 16,270 miles of railway in operation. At the end of the Laurier régime there were 26,977 miles in service. Most of this new mileage was west of the great lakes, and was due to the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific ; to the network of railways of the Canadian Northern ; and to the large extensions made between 1896 and 1911 by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. In the single year 1911 this company established 41 new towns in the prairie provinces, and in 1911 it had 11,756 miles of railway in service, with 4,381 miles under construction, as compared with 7251 in service and 1781 under construction in 1896. In 1896 the aggregate freight handled by all the railways was twenty-four million tons ; for 1911 it was nearly eighty million tons.

Statistics that best gauge the growth of the west are those of elevator capacity at Fort William and Port Arthur ; for except in times of extraordinary pressure all the grain grown in the prairie provinces passes through these elevators at the Lake Superior ports en route for the eastern provinces and the markets of Great Britain. In 1896 the storage capacity at the head of lake navigation was 4,350,000 bushels. In 1911 it was 25,700,000 bushels ; and enormous as had been the increase in storage capacity, there was proof in the winter months of 1911–12 that it had not nearly kept pace with the increase in production of the grain-growing provinces.

Art. X.—GREAT BRITAIN, GERMANY AND LIMITED WAR.

1. *Some Principles of Maritime Strategy.* By Julian S. Corbett, LL.M. London: Longmans. 1911.
2. *Naval Strategy: compared and contrasted with the Principles and Practice of Military Operations on Land.* By Captain A. T. Mahan, D.C.L., LL.D., United States Navy. London: Sampson Low. 1911.

Speaking at Glasgow on the 9th of February this year, the First Lord of the Admiralty defined the relative importance of their navies to Germany and Great Britain in words which appear to have embodied the general consensus of opinion of the people of these Islands, if we may judge by the reception accorded in the Press to his remarks. Mr. Churchill said:

'The British Navy is to us a necessity and, from some points of view, the German Navy is to them more in the nature of a luxury. Our naval power involves British existence. It is existence to us; it is expansion to them. We cannot menace the peace of a single Continental hamlet, nor do we wish to do so, no matter how great and supreme our Navy may become. But on the other hand, the whole fortunes of our race and Empire, the whole treasure accumulated during so many centuries of sacrifice and achievement would perish and be swept utterly away if our naval supremacy were to be impaired. It is the British Navy which makes Great Britain a Great Power. But Germany was a Great Power, respected and honoured all over the world, before she had a single ship. Those facts ought clearly to be stated, because there is no doubt that there is a disposition in some quarters to suppose that Great Britain and Germany are on terms of equality so far as naval risks are concerned. Such a supposition is utterly untrue.'*

As a statement of fact, we doubt whether this pronouncement was questioned in any responsible newspaper published in Great Britain. Where criticism was to be observed, it was limited to questioning the opportuneness of the pronouncement at a moment when his Majesty's Government was believed to be engaged in delicate negotiations at Berlin with a view to improving the relations of Great Britain and Germany. To newspapers representing every shade of opinion in this country it appeared to be a self-evident proposition that, since the

* The Times of the 10th of February 1912.

heart of the British Empire is an Island State, a navy so powerful as to assure to us what is called, somewhat loosely, 'Command of the Sea' is a necessity of our existence. Similarly, the fact that the German Empire is Continental in situation and possesses a very large and well-trained army—which is the German nation in arms—has led to a belief, widely entertained in this country, that to Germany a powerful navy is not a prime necessity, that it is, in Mr. Churchill's words, 'of the nature of a luxury.' A good deal of surprise, and perhaps some little irritation, followed the discovery that Mr. Churchill's pronouncement, so far from being accepted in Germany as a statement of fact, was held in that country to show that we in England completely misunderstood the German point of view about their navy, in that a responsible British Cabinet Minister could describe as a 'luxury' a navy which in the estimation of German public opinion is held to be no less a necessity to Germany than is her own navy to Great Britain.

If we put on one side the statements of extremists such as the more violent of the German Anglophobes, who clamour in season and out of season for such increase to the German navy as will admit of it eventually engaging our fleet on equal terms, we find that the contention of the great body of moderate public opinion in Germany—which far outweighs all extremists, whether purely Anglophobe or purely pacificist—is that the recent remarkable progress of their country in commerce and industry has built up an oversea trade which requires the protection afforded by a strong fleet. In Germany we have also to note the prevalence of a school of thought, whose exponents are for the most part soldiers, which demands a strong navy to protect the coast towns of Germany from the threat of operations by a hostile army disembarked under cover of a British fleet, since such operations, or rather the anticipation of such operations, might divert from the theatres of war on the Eastern and Western frontiers forces better employed in strengthening the main German armies engaged against Russia and France.

In short, public opinion in Germany, whilst approving of the creation of a fleet, in the words of the preamble to the Navy Bill, 'of such strength that, even for the mightiest naval 'power, a war with Germany would involve such risks as to 'jeopardise its own supremacy,' denies any intention of building against the British navy and asserts that Germany is only building in accordance with her needs. British public opinion, on the other hand, is inclined to view the rapid growth of the German fleet as an indication of aggressive purpose,

and to read into the preamble of the German Navy Bill an intention at some future date to attempt to wrest from us our sovereignty of the sea. Perhaps this view of Germany's effort to create a navy rests on the unspoken belief held by most Englishmen that a navy which is not supreme is of no real use to the country which owns it, since by evaluating the fighting worth of the navies of Europe in capital ships it is possible to determine which fleet is the stronger and therefore which will find itself in command of the sea should war break out. Now a rough calculation shows that the British navy is rather more than twice as strong as the German navy, and we know the German navy is growing both in the number of its ships and in their size and armament. The deduction commonly made is that Germany must be endeavouring to overtake us in shipbuilding, since a fleet so much smaller than the British fleet will be but little use to Germany in war as it cannot ensure to her command of the sea. Of course we are not now referring to instructed professional opinion, whether in Germany or England—that is to say, to the opinion of experts who have studied naval war and its bearing on international relations. We have endeavoured to state as fairly as we can what we conceive to be the uninstructed opinion of the great body of the unprofessional public in the two countries, which, after all, on any subject, is what we call public opinion. It is clear that this public opinion in Germany and Great Britain has formed radically different conceptions of the rôle in war of a fleet which is not supreme: in short, Englishmen and Germans do not think alike about one important aspect of the use of fleets in war. We therefore welcome the publication of two notable books on naval war, whose titles appear at the head of this article, as affording us an opportunity of checking the estimate formed by public opinion of the function in war of the German navy by reference to the principles enunciated and developed by such recognised authorities on naval history and naval warfare as Admiral Mahan and Mr. Julian Corbett.

When we remember the decisive rôle in moulding history which has fallen to the lot of those nations which from Salamis to Trafalgar have established in war effective command of the sea, it is remarkable to note how small is the general body of literature which concerns itself with the principles of naval warfare as compared with the output of those writers whose theme is the principles and practice of war on land. In the introductory chapter to his 'Naval Strategy' Admiral Mahan tells us that for a long time he has made a practice of searching

the catalogues of the naval and military booksellers in Europe and America in order to add to the library of the United States Naval War College 'whatever could be found bearing 'in any way on the Art of Naval War . . . with the result 'that a single bookshelf contains all that could be shown on the 'subject of Naval Tactics; and of that space nearly one half 'is occupied with elaborate treatises upon the tactics of sailing 'ships, from Paul Hoste to Chopart.' As to naval strategy he adds nothing, 'for outside of occasional papers, of the nature of 'magazine articles, there was no formal treatise except Colomb's '"Naval Warfare," published in 1890. Reliance for principles 'had to be entirely upon works devoted to land strategy.' The words we have quoted were spoken in 1892. Since then Admiral Mahan notes a revival of interest in naval matters, which has led to the publication of numerous works on naval history which now form a rich mine whence constructive thinkers may extract the precious ore of principles and then fashion that rare metal into a general body of theory fit to serve the purposes of practical sailors and statesmen charged with the shaping of naval policy in peace and war. He attributes this recent efflorescence in historical works to an awakening of interest in naval matters in this generation.

'Speaking only of the two languages familiar to me, French and English, I think it a moderate statement that thirty years ago works like those of Darrieus and Daveluy in France, or the historical works of Julian Corbett in England—I refer specifically to his "England in the Mediterranean" and "England in the Seven Years' War"—could not have been undertaken. They could not; not because the material for them did not exist, nor yet the brains to utilise the material, but because there was not that general interest which brings the brains and the material into fruitful contact.'

With the modesty which should be a characteristic of all whose high calling it is to serve their country in the Army or the Navy, Admiral Mahan omits to tell us that we owe the newly awakened interest in naval affairs which to-day is to be found amongst all the nations in no small measure to his own labours in the field of naval history. Chancellors of the Exchequer may groan over the demand for ever-increasing naval expenditure and pacificists may deplore the vast sums devoted by all the Powers to what they call the mad competition in naval armaments, but if they go below the surface, and seek for the reason of the increased burdens laid upon the nations, they will find one more example of the truth that it is thought which moves material things and not matter which sways thought;

one more proof of the aphorism that the men of action of the world—the statesmen, the financiers, the admirals—are but puppets at the end of strings pulled by some remote and perhaps little known thinker. If an unknown Captain Mahan of the United States Navy had not during the 'eighties thought so deeply about his profession of war at sea, and had not clothed his thoughts in the lucid and convincing language which lends quality and power to his historical work, it is doubtful whether the nations of Continental Europe, whose mental horizons, like their vulnerable frontiers, had been for long bounded by the land, would have turned their eyes seaward in their restless search for security and dominion. Mahan's 'Influence of Sea Power upon History'—followed by the 'Influence of Sea Power upon the French Revolution and 'Empire'—marked the beginning of a new epoch of thought on war as pregnant of consequences to the world, perhaps as momentous, as the publication of Clausewitz's 'Vom Krieg.' The German thinker, for it is as a thinker rather than as a soldier or a strategist in the narrower sense of the term that we prefer to estimate the father of modern war, taught the statesmen of Continental Europe the nature of war, a lesson which has borne as its fruit the conception of the nation in arms which is the ruling factor in the life of the Continent of Europe to-day. Mahan, by writing of the influence of sea power upon history, pointed to the road on which the nations are now jostling one another in search for that which they believe will aid them to influence the future. If it is not the whole truth that 'Words alone are certain good,' it is a fact beyond dispute that in the art of war, a great art worthy to rank as such with any practised by man, thought enshrined in words, and by words conveyed to the minds of the chosen few gifted to appreciate the force of thought, has done more to mould the world than all the bludgeonings of unnumbered, unrecorded and unanalysed battlefields, which have but left some nations stronger and others weaker for their happening. The teaching of Clausewitz, as practised by Moltke, has transformed Europe into a vast camp wherein men ceaselessly prepare for war, which they have been taught is but national policy pushed beyond the sphere of diplomacy. The teaching of Mahan has materially contributed to the creation of the new navies of Germany and Japan and to the increased interest of all nations in questions of naval armament. On Europe the German thinker brought the blood tax of universal service; to the count of the American sailor-historian may fairly be charged much of the financial strain due to an international

competition in naval strength, which is the direct consequence of opening the eyes of Europe to the value of sea power. Even in England, in the very heart of an oversea Empire, our eyes were but half opened to the meaning of command of the sea until this American sailor came and bade us turn them upon 'those far distant, storm-beaten ships, upon which the Grand 'Army never looked, which stood between it and the dominion 'of the world.' One consequence of his teaching has been that here in England successive First Lords of the Admiralty have spoken to a more or less enlightened audience when they have demanded from the House of Commons ever-increasing votes for naval construction to maintain what is called our command of the sea. Since what we must call the advent of Captain Mahan, there has been no question of allowing the navy to lapse in efficiency to the condition in which it was found by the three admirals whose report in the 'eighties disclosed a state of unreadiness for war which justly alarmed the nation.

It was therefore with keen expectation that we turned to Captain (now Admiral) Mahan's latest book when we read upon the cover a title so comprehensive as 'Naval Strategy.' We hoped to find that the master who had limned for us the influence of sea power upon history had now produced a work on the principles and practice of war at sea worthy to rank with Clausewitz's analysis of war on land; that the historian turned teacher would be still as clear and compelling, and no less illuminating, than in the books we knew and valued. Unfortunately this is not the case. '"Naval Strategy," compared and con-'trasted with the principles and practice of military operations 'on land,' is but the reprint of a series of lectures delivered to the United States Naval War College between the years 1887 and 1911. The teaching is the same, but the book itself is below the high standard which Captain Mahan has accustomed us to look for in his historical works. The difference between this volume and its forerunner, 'The Influence of 'Sea Power upon the French Revolution and Empire,' is just the difference between a collection of lectures delivered to a particular professional audience and a book written for a wider public which comprises statesmen, soldiers, historians and men of affairs as well as professional sailors. It is to be regretted that instead of republishing his lectures, some apparently verbatim, Admiral Mahan did not write a book on naval strategy such as he alone could have written especially since his rival in the field, Mr. Julian Corbett, does not see eye to eye with him in his presentation of the principles of naval

war deduced from history. Our quarrel with Admiral Mahan is not that his lectures are not good lectures on naval strategy, but that he might have, and has not, given us a great book on naval war. Such a book is wanted to set a standard in all discussions of naval questions as high as the standard now is in questions concerning the use of armies in war. That standard the book before us we fear will not materially help to set; its locutions are too reminiscent of the lecture hall and in places its phraseology is difficult to follow when unillumined by the gesture and expression which aid an audience in following a lecturer.

Mr. Corbett's book is a more finished work and suffers from none of the defects we have noticed in Admiral Mahan's republished lectures. He begins with a well-reasoned plea for the theoretical study of war, and devotes the first part of his book to an extremely interesting examination of the 'Theory' 'of War,' which he rightly insists is an essential preliminary to the study of strategy. Our countrymen have hitherto not done their duty by the theory of war: the practical English mind has tended in the past to regard war as so much an affair of application that the theory upon which all application must be founded, if it is to endure, has undoubtedly been neglected by students and teachers in this country. But this is a point we have developed in former numbers of this Review in its relation to the training of our army for war, so we will not now recur to it again. Still it is encouraging to find an acknowledged authority on naval history whose studies of maritime war have led him to say:

'The last thing that an explorer arrives at is a complete map that will cover the whole ground he has travelled, but for those who come after him and would profit by and extend his knowledge his map is the first thing with which they will begin. So it is with strategy. Before we start upon its study we seek a chart which will show us at a glance what exactly is the ground we have to cover and what are the leading features which determine its form and general characteristics. Such a chart a "theory of war" alone can provide. It is for this reason that in the study of war we must get our theory clear before we can venture in search of practical conclusions. So great is the complexity of war that without such a guide we are sure to go astray amidst the bewildering multiplicity of tracks and obstacles that meet us at every step. If for continental strategy its value has been proved abundantly, then for maritime strategy, where the conditions are far more complex, the need of it is even greater.'*

* Corbett, 'Some Principles of Maritime Strategy,' p. 13.

And again :

'. . . it is of little use to approach naval strategy except through the theory of war. Without such theory we can never really understand its scope or meaning, nor can we hope to grasp the forces which most profoundly affect its conclusions.' *

Since our purpose in this article is to estimate the place in war of a navy which, though powerful, is not supreme, by the light of the conclusions arrived at by Mr. Corbett and Admiral Mahan in their most recent pronouncements on the subject of naval war, it behoves us, as a preliminary step, to examine the theory of war upon which the authorities we refer to base the studies which lead them to the conclusions we propose to utilise. Only thus can we appreciate the validity of those conclusions and their consequent suitability as standards for our judgement.

Before considering the operations which are particular to naval war, Mr. Corbett devotes nearly a quarter of his book to a discussion of the theory of war, in which he examines what he calls the Continental theory, or theory of unlimited war, and the British theory, or theory of limited war.

' The tendency of British warfare,' he tells us, ' to take the lower or limited form, has always been as clearly marked as is the opposite tendency on the Continent. To attribute such a tendency, as is sometimes the fashion, to an inherent lack of warlike spirit is sufficiently contradicted by the results it has achieved. There is no reason indeed to put it down to anything but a sagacious instinct for the kind of war which best accords with the conditions of our existence. So strong has this instinct been that it has led us usually to apply the lower form not only where the object of the war was a well-defined territorial one, but to cases in which its correctness was less obvious . . . we have applied it, and applied it on the whole with success, when we have been acting in concert with Continental allies for an unlimited object—where, that is, the common object has been the common overthrow of the common enemy.' †

Mr. Corbett correctly attributes the prime importance of Clausewitz's work to his enunciation of the proposition that ' war is a mere continuation of policy by other means.' It is this statement, reached through a process of hard philosophical reasoning by a thinker who was also an experienced soldier, which forms the starting point for all examination of the theory of war. The truth of Clausewitz's initial definition

* Corbett, ' Some Principles of Maritime Strategy,' p. 9.
† Ibid. p. 73.

'that war is an act of violence to compel our opponent to do our 'will,' does not conflict with this proposition inasmuch as 'our 'will' in the one statement is 'our policy' in the other. In Mr Corbett's words:

'The practical importance of this conception will now become clear. . . . When a Chief of the Staff is asked for a war plan he must not say we will make war in such and such a way because it was Napoleon's or Moltke's way. He will ask what is the political object of the war, what are the political conditions, and how much does the question at issue mean respectively to ourselves and to our adversary. It is these considerations which determine the nature of the war. This primordial question settled, he will be in a position to say whether the war is of the same nature as those in which Napoleon's and Moltke's methods were successful, or whether it is of another nature in which those methods failed. He will then design and offer a war plan, not because it has the hall mark of this or that great master of war, but because it is the one which has been proved to fit the kind of war in hand. To assume that one method of conducting war will suit all kinds of war is to fall a victim to abstract theory, and not to be a prophet of reality, as the narrowest disciples of the Napoleonic school are apt to see themselves.'

This passage which we have quoted from Mr. Corbett has an important bearing on the position he himself adopts at a later stage in his exposition of war with a limited objective when questioning the soundness of the conception of war held by von der Goltz, Prince Kraft von Hohenlohe and other adherents of what he calls the German, or Continental, School of Strategy. This conception, which he also calls Napoleonic, he summarises as war, regarded as an act made with the whole force of the nation; as a persistent effort maintained until the enemy is completely overthrown; in which the offensive is to be preferred at almost any risk; and in which the main objective is the enemy's armed forces. It is, in fact, what Clausewitz called absolute war or unlimited war, where, as Mr. Corbett says, 'we get the conception of 'two armed nations flinging themselves one upon the other, and 'continuing the struggle with the utmost strength and energy 'they can command till one or other is no longer capable of 'resistance.'* As against this conception Mr. Corbett sets that of limited war or war for a limited objective, which he attributes to 'the British or Maritime School—that is our 'own traditional school.' The conception of limited war is to be found in the following statement of Clausewitz:

* Corbett, p. 22.

'The smaller the sacrifice we demand from our opponent, the smaller presumably will be the means of resistance he will employ, and the smaller his means, the smaller will ours be required to be. Similarly, the smaller our political object, the less value shall we set upon it and the more easily shall we be induced to abandon it.'

Further developing this proposition, Mr. Corbett tells us that Clausewitz

'saw that the distinction between limited and unlimited war connoted a cardinal distinction in the methods of waging it. When the object was unlimited, and would consequently call forth your enemy's whole war power, it was evident that no firm decision of the struggle could be reached till his war power was entirely crushed. Unless you had a reasonable hope of being able to do this it was bad policy to seek your end by force—that is, you ought not to go to war. In the case of a limited object, however, the complete destruction of your enemy's armed force was beyond what was necessary. Clearly you could achieve your end if you could seize the object, and by availing yourself of the elements of strength inherent in the defensive could set up such a situation that it would cost the enemy more to turn you out than the object was worth to him. Here then was a wide difference in the fundamental postulate of your war plan. In the case of an unlimited war your main strategical offensive must be directed against the armed forces of the enemy; in the case of a limited war, even where its object was positive, it need not be.' *

This doctrine of limited war, as expounded by Mr. Corbett, is undoubtedly alluring to the people of an island State which knows itself to be strong at sea, if weak on land: it accords with the frequent action of our statesmen in the past: it is in harmony with an instinct deep-rooted in our English souls which Bacon voiced after the defeat of the Armada: 'This 'much is certain, he that commands the sea is at great liberty 'and may take as much or as little of the war as he will, 'whereas those that be strongest by land are many times 'nevertheless in great straits.' † We have waged limited war in the past, in Canada and in the Crimea—is there any reason why we should not do so again, and that in the most arduous struggle which we can be called upon to undertake, a war with the German Empire? We think that there is such a reason, and that it is to be found in the very pages in which Mr. Corbett preaches the doctrine of limited war as a conception essentially and appropriately British.

---

* Corbett, p. 42. † Quoted by Mr. Corbett, p. 55.

To some minds the words 'limited war' conjure up a vision of armies which, presumably by mutual consent, have decided to expend in fighting only a limited portion of their surplus energy—a vision of limited war as a war of limited fighting. Mr. Corbett tells us that 'if we isolate in our minds the forces 'engaged in any theatre of war the abstract conception re-'appears. So far as those forces are concerned, war is a 'question of fighting in which each belligerent should endea-'vour by all the means at his command and with all his energy 'to destroy the other.'* But what is this if not the Napoleonic conception? Is it not merely another way of saying that in any given theatre of war, whatever may be the nature of the war waged, a commander must fight as Napoleon fought or as Moltke fought, or be beaten: that whatever we may choose to call the form of war we adopt, if we hope to win we must have superior force at the decisive point, at the decisive time, be that force men or ships—or men *and* ships. The recognition of this fact will go far to check much loose talk and ill-considered advocacy of war with a limited objective as a panacea for all the needs of the British Empire in war. We emphasise this point not because we believe that Mr. Corbett is likely to fall into the error to which we have drawn attention, but because his book may be used by would-be disciples to misapply in our army and navy a theory which we believe to be dangerous if it is accepted without a critical examination revealing the extremely limited sphere in which the doctrine of limited war finds a place at the present time. Mr. Corbett has shown us that the limited objective had a place in the armoury of British war in the past; but the fact remains, limited war can only be used in very special circumstances. Mr. Corbett tells us what are the conditions postulated by war with a limited objective. It will be instructive to follow him and see for ourselves how his postulates stand in relation to the data of policy which govern that war which appears at the present moment to be a possibility, even if the resources of diplomacy are equal to eliminating it from the sphere of probability—war between England and Germany.

After discussing Clausewitz's conception of war with a limited object, and Jomini's approximation to it, Mr. Corbett says: '. . . for a true limited object we must have not only the 'power of isolation, but also the power by a secure home 'defence of barring an unlimited counterstroke.'

---

* Corbett, p. 26.

And again:

'We come to this final proposition—that limited war is only possible to island Powers or between Powers which are separated by the sea, and then only when the Power desiring limited war is able to command the sea to such a degree as to be able not only to isolate the distant object, but also to render impossible the invasion of his home territory . . . *limited wars do not turn upon the armed strength of the belligerents, but upon the amount of that strength which they are able or willing to bring to bear at the decisive point.*' *

The words we have placed in italics will make an especial appeal to those who see in war with a limited objective a short cut to victory for a Power which is strong at sea and weak on land; a short cut which has the supreme merit of making victory possible to that nation which has made the smallest sacrifices to deserve it.

What do Mr. Corbett's postulates of the conditions which make possible this form of war amount to? He has taken Clausewitz's original conception of a war in which the 'object' is merely to make some conquests on the frontier of his (i.e. the 'enemy's) country, either for the purpose of retaining them 'permanently or of turning them to account as a matter of ex-'change in settling terms of peace,' † and he has developed it, and incidentally restricted it, to the case of an island Power controlling the sea which wages war against another Power by attacking and possessing itself of an objective upon the recovery of which that other Power, by reason of its position, can only devote a portion of its strength, and yet that objective is one to which that Power attaches so much importance that it will be a counter of the first importance in making peace.

Let us apply Mr. Corbett's thesis to the concrete case of a war between Great Britain and Germany and see for ourselves how far it helps us. At the same time let us bear in mind the fundamental proposition enunciated by Clausewitz, upon which Mr. Corbett rightly lays so much stress, 'that war is merely the 'continuation of policy by other means.' Where in the world are we to find an objective isolated from Germany by the sea so that we, if we command the sea, can regulate the force Germany sends there, and yet of such vital consequence to Germany that our possession of it will compel her to make peace on our terms? Merely to put the question is to answer

* Corbett, pp. 54–55.

† Clausewitz, 'On War,' Prefatory Notice, p. vii. Quoted by Corbett, p. 46.

it. A war between us and Germany cannot be a war with a limited objective. We want nothing that Germany has, except her thoroughness, her organisation, and her fixed purpose to apply science and culture to national life ; we want, in short, nothing from her that can be got by fighting, except the assurance that we shall not be attacked. From Germany we want nothing but the assurance of safety, hence an Anglo-German war, if such a war should ever be, must be on our side a war for an unlimited objective, the maintenance of our position as a Great Power.

War with a limited objective is essentially the weapon of a country which is expanding, and therefore seeks for territorial acquisitions. Given that a nation desires a certain piece of territory, it is conceivable that the best way of obtaining it, if its geographical position and the sea power of the nation desiring it admit, may well be to go and seize it, and hold it against such efforts as the original possessor can bring to bear for its recovery. This is undoubtedly the best way of enforcing the policy which aims at obtaining the territory in question, if circumstances preclude the nation which in the first instance owned the territory coveted from direct action, with its whole strength, against the most vital interests of its adversary. This direct action finds its highest form in invasion and the overthrow of the most important armed force which can be brought against it, what Mr Corbett calls 'an unlimited 'counterstroke.'

If we examine the conception of war with a limited objective in the light of Clausewitz's fundamental proposition, that war is but the continuation of policy, we are led to conclude that it is only applicable in the case of a nation whose policy is to acquire, as the result of victory, some definite limited territorial objective. That is to say, that it can only be applied by a nation which is seeking for territorial increment, and then only, as Mr. Corbett points out, when the objective of policy is a territory situated in a particular manner with respect to the two belligerents. War with a limited objective must in its very nature be a rare form of war and one which at the present day concerns England least of all the Great Powers. It may be urged that what we have written leads to the inference that, even if unsuitable to us as a method to follow, limited war is suited to the policy of some of our possible enemies who may not be so sated with oversea possessions as we are ; in fact, that it would accord with the needs of a young, growing and acquisitive Power such as Germany, and is therefore worthy of careful study, as we may find ourselves the victim of limited

war even if we are unlikely to wage it ourselves. But here we are at once met by the objection that for Germany, or any other Power at war with us, to endeavour to force upon us a limited form of war, she must be able to get an army to the territorial objective she covets and to maintain it there until its pressure has forced us to make peace. This postulates one of two things, either that our antagonist has command of the sea, in which case we are beaten without any further effort on his part, or that his navy has been able to protect the passage of troopships across an uncommanded sea—but in this case would it not be wiser for our antagonist to use this facility of passage to pour troops into England itself, and so replace the hazard attendant on any distant oversea operations by the greater probability of decisive success after a shorter sea passage? That in war the greater includes the less is perhaps the most important lesson Napoleon taught Europe; it is not one which Continental strategists are likely to overlook; indeed, it is because of their very insistence on its importance that Mr. Corbett falls so foul of them and lays so much stress on the doctrine he has evolved and has dubbed the British, or Maritime, conception of war. Of that doctrine, if relegated to its proper place, we are prepared to take account as an interesting but, at the present day, essentially minor portion of the theory of war. Where we part company with Mr. Corbett is when he would have us believe that for an island Power, circumstanced as is Great Britain now, war with a limited objective is a thing to be reckoned with. To support his thesis by adducing some recent example of limited war which has not been waged in and for an island, such as Cuba in the American-Spanish war, Mr. Corbett attributes this character to the Russo-Japanese war. He tells us that:

'. . . the Far Eastern struggle is seen to develope on the same lines as all our great maritime wars of the past, which Continental strategists have so persistently excluded from the field of their study. It presents the three normal phases—the initial offensive movement to seize the territorial objective, the secondary phase, which forces an attenuated offensive on the enemy, and the final stage of pressure, in which there is a return to the offensive "according," as Jomini puts it, "to circumstances and your relative force in order to obtain the cession desired."' *

When Mr. Corbett asks us to believe that the Japanese operations developed on lines similar to those of 'all our great

* Corbett, p. 79.

'maritime wars of the past,' he makes a large draft on our imagination. Let us see what course events took in Manchuria. To begin with, we will admit that though she went to war to prevent Russia absorbing Korea—since a Russian Korea would be a danger to herself—the object of the war for Japan was a territorial acquisition, but that in itself is not enough to constitute war with a limited objective. On Mr. Corbett's own showing a characteristic of such a war is that 'in favourable 'circumstances . . . (and here lies the great value of the limited 'form) we are able to control the amount of force we shall 'have to encounter'*—a statement which contains the implication that in those favourable circumstances we ourselves can employ, within reason, as much force as we care to develope. As the war developed we find Japan compelled to put forth her whole fighting strength, and yet at Liao Yang, the first great battle of the war, the Japanese were outnumbered and were within an ace of defeat. At the end of the war the Russian army still further outnumbered the Japanese, and yet the full fighting strength of Japan was in the field and her resources, after a series of victories and a successful siege, were strained to breaking point. Japan had evidently failed to control the amount of force Russia was able to put into the field, although she had destroyed her fleet and beaten her armies. When peace came the Russian army was stronger, more efficient and better organised than at any period of the war. If in such circumstances Russia had to make peace we must seek for the reason elsewhere than in Manchuria, where the situation had assumed a shape not unfavourable to her. It is to be found in the internal condition of Russia, and in the fact that the Manchurian war was not popular in the country; so that the Japanese field army was saved from the crushing weight of an unlimited counterstroke by the pressure exerted in Russia by the revolutionary movement, which the Czar's Government considered it was worth great sacrifices in the Far East to have leisure to suppress at home. But this condition which brought about peace has nothing whatever to do with the nature of the war; it depends on the cause for which the two nations are fighting and on the course events have taken. Given that a war is unpopular to begin with, and becomes more so as it progresses from defeat to defeat, the Government which is waging the unpopular war will eventually be compelled to conclude an unfavourable peace.

The moral we draw from Manchuria is that if it is true that

---

* Corbett, p. 82.

Japan was indeed fighting a war for a limited objective, she would seem to have done so under conditions unfavourable to that form of war, since she completely failed to derive from limited war its greatest benefit, the power of limiting the hostile force to be encountered. This limitation of the hostile force to be encountered lay not in the form of war Japan chose to wage but in the carrying capacity of the Siberian railway. The steel ribbon which linked Kuropatkin's army to the heart of Russia differentiated the Manchurian war from the Crimean war and from that long struggle in which we took Canada from France. It made it for Japan a war in which it was possible for her antagonist to develope, as she eventually did, a force sufficient to overthrow the entire fighting strength of Japan. Had the great army which Russia assembled at Harbin been used for this end the consequences to Japan would have been those essentially characteristic of unlimited war, since they would have involved her downfall as a Great Power in the Far East. Can we reasonably describe such a war as partaking of the character of our great maritime wars of the past, as being in truth an encouraging example of limited war waged by an island State against a Continental nation, as Mr. Corbett would have us believe? Is not the truth rather to be found in the proposition that for the Russo-Japanese war to become an encouraging example of limited war it would be necessary for Korea and Manchuria to be an island or islands in a sea controlled by Japan?

To support his contention that the Japanese operations in the war with Russia followed the normal course of our own maritime wars, we find Mr. Corbett committing himself to the following statements:

'In dealing with the Japanese plan of operations, it is assumed that the occupation of Korea and the isolation of Port Arthur were but preliminaries to a concentric advance on Liao Yang, "which was kept in view as the first objective of the operations on land." *But surely on every theory of war the first objective of the Japanese on land was Seoul, where they expected to have to fight their first important action* against troops advancing from the Yalu; and surely their second was Port Arthur, with its fleet and arsenal, which they expected to reduce with little less difficulty than they had met with ten years before against the Chinese. Such at least was the actual progression of events, and a criticism which regards operations of such magnitude and ultimate importance as mere incidents of strategic deployment is only to be explained by the domination of the Napoleonic idea of war, against the universal application of which Clausewitz so solemnly protested. It is the work of men who have a natural difficulty in conceiving a war plan that does not

culminate in a Jena or a Sedan. It is a view surely which is the child of theory, bearing no relation to the actuality of the war in question and affording no explanation of its ultimate success. The truth is that so long as the Japanese acted on the principles of limited war, as laid down by Clausewitz and Jomini and plainly deducible from our own rich experience, they progressed beyond all their expectations; but so soon as they departed from them and suffered themselves to be confused with Continental theories they were surprised by unaccountable failure.' *

Before we examine these statements in detail, let us put before ourselves clearly the situation with which Japan was confronted. She wished to obtain possession of Korea and Port Arthur, and force upon Russia a peace which would give her the territory she desired to obtain. To ensure such a peace, there was only one course open to her, namely, to beat such forces as Russia could bring to bear against her and to go on beating them until Russia decided to make peace on her terms. Japan knew her own strength and that of her antagonist: she was aware that the Siberian railway made it possible for Russia to accumulate in the Far East an army numerically so strong that, if she were allowed time to develope her resources, any force which Japan could land in Korea or Manchuria would eventually be overborne and driven into the sea. Therefore in order to obtain her territorial objective —her ultimate objective—she must defeat the Russian field army before it became too strong for her to hope for success against it: thus the Russian field army became her primary objective. This being so, the Japanese forces had to be deployed for the attack on that primary objective, the hostile main army, in such a manner as, in the opinion of the Japanese strategists, would best ensure its early and decisive defeat. But now we have to recognise a complicating factor introduced by the presence in the fortress of Port Arthur of a Russian squadron which, if used with skill and boldness, might interrupt the communications between Japan and her field armies, and by such interruption render impossible the advance against the Russian main army, which we have called the Japanese primary objective. Again, it was possible that if the Russian Pacific squadron was not destroyed it would be reinforced by the Baltic squadron, when the strength of the combined Russian fleet would enable it to beat the Japanese fleet, and so isolate the army operating in Manchuria. Hence it became necessary to attack Port Arthur and destroy the Pacific

* Corbett, pp. 80–81.

squadron concurrently with the pursuit of the primary objective, the attempt to crush the main Russian field army.

If there is one thing in the history of the Russo-Japanese war which stands out more clearly than any other, it is that Seoul was never the first objective of the Japanese on land in the sense Mr. Corbett assumes in order to fortify his thesis ; the Japanese objective was, and continued to be, the Russian field army. At no moment after the outbreak of war did they expect to have to fight at Seoul an ' important action ' against troops advancing from the Yalu.' A calculation of time and space and the force available to the Russians for an offensive at the beginning of the war—all facts within the purview of the Japanese General Staff—show that the very most the Russians could do was to send into Korea an expedition of the nature of a raid, since no adequate support could be afforded to it by the main army slowly assembling on the railway and unable to operate away from it for lack of transport, and that such an expedition would be doomed to failure. When Mr. Corbett tells us that in their attack on the secondary objective, Port Arthur, the Japanese expected to reduce that fortress ' with little less difficulty than they had met with ' ten years before against the Chinese,' we wonder in all seriousness what he means. Does he really mean what he says, that the Japanese expected to take Port Arthur more easily from the Russians than from the Chinese ? In the case of any other writer on war we should assume that by a misprint he has been made to say ' less ' when he had written ' more,' but in the case of Mr. Corbett we hesitate to adopt so simple an explanation. His presentation of the facts of the Russo-Japanese war is so strange, and the opinions to which he commits himself are so remarkable, that we feel that from this gifted pleader of special causes any statement is possible. In this opinion we are confirmed by Mr. Corbett's refusal to regard ' operations of such magnitude and ultimate importance ' (presumably the isolation of Port Arthur and the preliminaries to the concentric advance on Liao Yang by the Mandarin road and the railway) ' as mere incidents of strategic deploy- ' ment.' What in the world does he imagine a strategic deployment to be ? If words have any meaning, his obvious implication is that it is not a matter of much moment except in the eyes of those who are dominated by the Napoleonic idea of war, which Mr. Corbett not only abhors but to which he can rise superior. We who humbly agree with Moltke that a strategic deployment is the most important act in war, since an error made in the strategic deployment dogs a commander

through the whole course of his operations, cannot repudiate too strongly the misleading propositions which Mr. Corbett advances in the passage we have quoted. It really is deplorable that such teaching should emanate from one whom we believe to be a lecturer on Naval History at the Naval War School, and therefore in a position to disseminate his doctrines throughout the navy.

As we have said earlier in this article, we shall judge Mr. Corbett's competence to teach the principles of naval strategy by his exposition of the theory of war, on the importance of which he quite rightly lays great stress in his introductory chapter. If we find that his ideas about war are all wrong, it will establish a *prima facie* presumption that when we find Mr. Corbett in conflict with so deep a thinker on naval warfare as Admiral Mahan, we would do well to follow the American sailor rather than the English civilian, and that in estimating what the probable action of the German navy will be in war we must examine in a critical, if indeed not a suspicious, temper Mr. Corbett's theory of 'the fleet in being' around which so much controversy turns.

Mr. Corbett devotes the first quarter of his book to a discussion of the theory of war, which, however, turns out to be a discussion of the place in war of one particular theory—what Clausewitz calls war for a limited objective, and Mr. Corbett has named the British, or Maritime, conception of war—a conception which at best is only a part of war, and that not the major part, while at worst it proves to be an academic abstraction remote from the true conception of that war we as a nation are faced with to-day. As a nation we want nothing from anybody except to be allowed to enjoy and develope the possessions we acquired and the commerce we founded when our policy was one of expansion. When we come to close quarters with Mr. Corbett's theory of Maritime war, we find that if it has a place in war at all, that place is to be found only when our national policy demands of war that it should give us certain territorial objectives—a condition which has long since passed away. Thus we find that Mr. Corbett has done us the ill service of turning our eyes away from war as it is, to fix them upon war as it is not. If this ill service had been rendered by some unknown writer whose words carried no weight, we might let it pass, knowing that the false teaching would not go far or do much harm. Unfortunately Mr. Corbett is differently circumstanced; not only has he a considerable reputation as a serious naval historian, much of whose work is above reproach, but he is known to speak with authority to the younger generation of

naval officers, the correctness or otherwise of whose ideas on war is a most serious factor in our national security. If our admirals of to-day, and the captains who will be our admirals of to-morrow, learn to think incorrectly about war, they will be beaten when they are called upon to meet opponents who have learned to think straight and to know war as it is—an act of force in which success is to be sought in superior force applied at the decisive point at the decisive time; that is to say, in the overthrow of the enemy's armed force which in all times and in all places is the only justifiable objective of an army, a navy, or a nation which is fighting not for conquest but for existence. For Mr. Corbett to come forward to teach the men in whose hands rests the safety of England that they can win by some clever selection of an objective other than the enemy's armed forces is indeed deplorable.

We believe that in Mr. Corbett's presentation of what he calls the British, or Maritime, theory of war, there lies a real danger to our country, should his views meet with general acceptance, as would seem to be the case if we may judge by the wide measure of uncritical approbation extended to his book in the daily press. One consequence of his teaching will be the engendering of a belief that if we find ourselves at war with a Great Power we may hope for success by partly beating our antagonist in some distant theatre of war, which will lead to the inference that our national strength may safely be diminished provided we retain enough for limited or so-called British war. In the hands of those extremists who are never tired of clamouring for further reductions in our army, and view with suspicion the maintenance of a navy on the basis of two keels to one, this argument will be potent for evil. We gladly acquit Mr. Corbett of any bias towards the doctrines of this school of politicians, but it is only right to indicate the purpose to which his teaching may be put if its fallacy is not exposed before it is used for so anti-national an end. Another danger which lies hidden in Mr. Corbett's plausible theory is that its acceptance by the navy as an adequate theory of war, and not as a mere academic abstraction, will inevitably lead to divergence of view between the naval and military members of the Committee of Imperial Defence. If the military members think on war as Napoleon and Moltke thought, and as every cultured soldier of every European army thinks, while their naval colleagues are imbued with Mr. Corbett's theory of British, or Maritime, war, we do not see how any comprehensive and workable plan of combined operations for a great war can be evolved by a Cabinet which has to reconcile

schemes based on conceptions so divergent. If unity of doctrine within an army is an important factor making for success, it is not less true that to co-ordinate satisfactorily the joint efforts of an army and navy, it is essential that the two great fighting Services should hold a theory of war in common. It is conceivable that during some national crisis we might find the naval advisers of the Government propounding a scheme of operations involving the attempt to wage a war with a limited objective by using the army to assist the navy in operations against the enemy's colonies, islands off his coasts, or perhaps even, through a misunderstanding of the very nature of limited war, we might find them advocating disembarkations on the hostile coasts themselves, reminiscent of some of our minor operations during that Seven Years' War of which Mr. Corbett has told the story, and whence he would seem to have derived the theory to which we take exception. On the other hand, we might well find that the Government's military advisers, considering a war between this country and a Great Continental Power as one for an unlimited objective which demands the complete overthrow of the enemy, might be led to maintain the view that if we use our army in such a struggle it must be employed in conjunction with that of an ally in the decisive theatre of war, so as to ensure, as far as numbers ensure anything, that the main army of our adversary shall be confronted by a decisive preponderance of force in those battles which will alone affect the ultimate issue of the struggle on land. We do not envy the task which, in such an event as we have supposed, would rest upon the non-professional members of the Committee of Imperial Defence—and in particular upon the Prime Minister. What, in fact, he may well find himself called upon to do is to decide between his professional advisers, some of whom advocate a series of operations reminiscent of Toulon, Quiberon and Walcheren, while the others see in the campaign of Waterloo the logical consequence of Trafalgar. Should a future Prime Minister be confronted with so difficult a decision, he would do well to ask himself how far have the minds of his naval advisers been influenced by the theories propounded by the lecturer on Naval History at the War School, and to remember what Admiral Mahan in his most recent book tells us of naval campaigns, that 'it is significant 'that those most interesting and most clearly stamped with 'military insight have been directed in their main features by 'men not so much seamen as soldiers.'* The decision we trust

* Mahan, 'Naval Strategy,' p. 113.

he would arrive at is that if our army is to take an active part in such a war it will not be disseminated in minor operations, but will be used as a whole to assist any ally we may have to destroy the main body of our adversary's army; that he will remember that in war the greater does include the less although Mr. Corbett implies that this often is not the case.

If we have expressed our complete disagreement with Mr. Corbett's conception of British, or Maritime, war we do not wish it to be inferred that we deny the existence of a form of Maritime war which is essentially and appropriately British, although it is not that which Mr. Corbett advocates. It is to be found in the pages of Mahan's 'Influence of Sea Power 'upon the French Revolution,' where he tells us how, after the destruction of the French navy,

'to the strife of arms with the great Sea Power succeeded the strife of endurance. Amid all the pomp and circumstances of the war which for ten years to come desolated the Continent, amid all the tramping to and fro over Europe of the French armies and their auxiliary legions, there went on unceasingly that noiseless pressure upon the vitals of France, that compulsion whose silence, when once noted, becomes to the observer the most striking and awful mark of the working of Sea Power.'*

It is a theory of Maritime war which sees in the economic pressure of 'commerce prevention' a consequence of 'command 'of the sea' more pregnant of decisive influence than the power to move freely to some oversea objective the small army of an island State. In the past it has been hedged about with limitations which even to-day obscure a full appreciation of this method of applying force at sea: in his 'Naval Strategy' Admiral Mahan hardly mentions this aspect of his subject, while Mr. Corbett, whose treatment is more adequate and to whom we owe the substitution of the positive idea of 'commerce 'prevention' for the negative idea of 'commerce destruction' prevalent hitherto, is not prepared to admit that it is a more effective form of war than the 'war with a limited objective' he so strenuously advocates.

There are probably two principal reasons for this, of which the first is that in the past no nation, except England, was dependent upon oversea trade as are Continental nations to-day. Even a generation ago the oversea commerce of most European countries was small; as a factor in national life so important that its suppression would convulse the state, it did not exist

* Mahan, 'Influence of Sea Power upon the French Revolution,' vol. ii. p. 184.

in the precise form in which we find it to-day, partly because national life was less complex, and partly because the great nations of the Continent were more self-supporting. What we have not yet seen is a war in which a nation organised as are the France and Germany of to-day finds itself, soon after the outbreak of war, confronted with unemployment on a large scale and rapid arrest of industry, consequent on successful commerce prevention which has enhanced the cost of raw material by forcing it to use for transit railways instead of ships. This is not a question of stopping the food supply of such a nation; the requisite amount of food can probably always be imported over the land frontiers of a Continental Power, which has neutral or friendly neighbours; it is a question of so convulsing industry that the working men of the nation will not have the money wherewith to buy such food as is available. At the present time the working men of all Western European countries, unlike their forefathers, are organised in powerful trades unions which, in varying degrees it is true, exercise considerable political pressure on the State. We have absolutely no data for estimating what that pressure will be if the fact of war comes rapidly to connote the complete cessation of those industries which depend upon a large, regular and cheap supply of raw material on the one hand, or on the other, which equally depend upon the unrestricted freedom of sea-borne trade for the export of manufactured goods to foreign customers. As Mr. Corbett and Admiral Mahan agree in pointing out, 'command of the sea' means command of the sea communications between the nations. Given the present economic position of Europe and the importance which international credit has assumed in the provision of industry within a nation itself, and we can recognise that in the interruption of those communications, and the consequent drying up of credit, which depends on goods ordered and paid for being duly delivered, entailing disorganisation of industry, we have a weapon of the first importance for forcing peace upon such a nation. This condition has not heretofore existed in Europe: it is therefore not surprising that naval and military historians, who note the long years which passed between Trafalgar and its consummation at Leipsic and Waterloo, are inclined to lose sight of its vital importance at the present day in the case of the highly organised communities we are now concerned with. The second reason for their comparative neglect of this aspect of war is insistence on the proposition advanced with much ability by Mr. Corbett, that the attack and defence of trade is comprised in the attack and defence of the local areas

of trade and the termini of the great trade routes which is the affair of fleets. In fine, that command of the sea resulting from fleet actions, or the preponderance of force of one side being so great that the other cannot challenge it, confers such control over trade routes that the beaten, or weaker side, is driven to a sporadic, and usually pelagic, attack on trade which has never produced a decisive result. For instance, Mr. Corbett tells us that 'the probability . . . is that 'in the future the whole problem will be found to be simplified, 'and that the work of commerce protection will lie much more 'within the scope of large strategical treatment than it ever did 'before, with the result that the change should be found to tell 'substantially in favour of defence and against attack.'* In support of this contention he draws attention to the fact that the range of the modern cruiser is very small, owing to coal consumption, as compared with her predecessor of sailing days, while the provision of prize crews for her captures will rapidly reduce her efficiency. He continues :

'From these and similar considerations it is obvious that the possibilities of operations on the great trade routes are much less extensive than they were formerly, while to speak of cruisers "infesting" those routes is sheer hyperbole. Under modern conditions it is scarcely more feasible than it would be to keep up a permanent blockade of the British Isles.'†

And again :

'If our enemy tries to ignore our battle fleets, and devotes himself to operations against trade, he cannot dispute the command. Whatever his strength he must leave the command to us. He cannot do both systematically, and unless he attacks our trade systematically, by sustained strategical operations, he cannot hope to make any real impression.'‡

In all this Mr. Corbett appears to us to ignore that particular type of attack on trade which our enemy will probably make : attack by merchant ships armed with one or two guns. Such ships are the privateers of the next great war. By filling with coal their holds, which are no longer required for merchandise, they will have a fuel capacity enabling them to keep the sea for a very considerable period, certainly as much as a hundred days. Our possible enemies have arrogated to themselves the right to sink prizes instead of taking them into port to be condemned by a Prize Court, and have reserved to themselves the right to use improvised cruisers to prey on commerce.

* Corbett, p. 271. † Ibid. p. 273. ‡ Ibid. p. 379.

Such attack on commerce may be under the double disadvantage of being both pelagic and sporadic, but we are none the less convinced that it is a danger, and a very real one, which we must make up our minds betimes how to meet if used against us, and how best to use ourselves to cripple the trade of our possible adversary, so as to begin as early in the conflict as possible 'that noiseless pressure upon the vitals of "our enemy"; 'that compulsion whose silence, when once noted, becomes 'to the observer the most striking and vital mark of the 'working of Sea Power.'

We have now cleared the ground sufficiently to enable us to take up again the question we proposed to ourselves at the beginning of this article: What can the German fleet, notably inferior in strength to the British fleet, be expected to achieve in the face of our superior navy? Obviously, if the German fleet can attack our fleet at a moment when our squadrons are so separated as to be unable to support one another, it may hope to beat it in detail and so acquire command of the sea. But this postulates one of two things: either that the political situation has forced us to make a distant detachment of such size as to endanger our main concentration, or that our concentration is itself faulty. If our Government pursues a prudent foreign policy the former alternative is unlikely to occur. If the Admiralty applies to our fleet Admiral Mahan's wise dictum on concentration our enemy will not find the opportunity he seeks. Admiral Mahan writes of concentration:

'The essential underlying idea is that of mutual support; that the entire force, however distributed at the moment, is acting in such wise that each part is relieved by the others of a part of its own burden; that it also does the same for them; while the disposition of the allotted stations facilitates also timely concentration in mass. A very considerable separation in space may be consistent with such mutual support.'*

If our Admiralty wishes to give to the German fleet the opportunity it seeks of beating us in detail, it will disregard this dictum of the American Admiral and, instead of concentrating our fleet in his sense of the word, it will operate as Mr. Corbett advocates in a chapter entitled 'Concentration and Dispersal,' which is irradiated by the following paragraph:

'To force an inferior enemy to concentrate is indeed the almost necessary preliminary to securing one of those crushing victories at which we must always aim, but which so seldom are obtained. It is

* Mahan, 'Naval Strategy,' pp. 74–75.

by forcing the enemy to attempt to concentrate that we get our opportunity by sagacious dispersal of crushing his divisions in detail. It is by inducing him to mass that we simplify our problem and compel him to choose between leaving to us the exercise of command and putting it to the decision of a great action.'*

If our enemy, accepting the proffered concentration, does in very fact concentrate, and then is unkind enough to seek for one of those so-seldom-obtained-yet-crushing victories over one of the detachments we have placed within his reach, we fear that the Board of Admiralty which has adopted the 'sagacious dispersal' Mr. Corbett advocates will have some difficulty in justifying its conduct to a possibly irate nation. This surely is strategy *in extremis* and from Mr. Corbett we prefer to take as a principle of Maritime war the aphorism that the normal condition of such war is not a commanded sea but an uncommanded sea. In impressing this fact upon his readers Mr. Corbett is doing a real service to his countrymen, who are too apt to assume that England is even now 'in 'command of the sea,' and will find herself in possession of 'command of the sea' even on the outbreak of war, merely because she has many more ships than any other nation. As Mr. Corbett tells us, 'command of the sea' has to be fought for, and our experience of the wars with France is that the process of obtaining 'command of the sea' may be a lengthy one. During that period of conflict what can the German navy do to justify the vast sums spent upon it of recent years? Can it protect the oversea commerce of Germany, and ensure that Hamburg and Bremen will still be able to trade with America and the Far East? The answer should be no, for to do so the German squadrons must control the foci and the terminals of the trade routes which reach the North Sea by way of the Channel and the Orkneys. To attempt this would bring them into collision with the British fleet protecting the use of the same trade routes by British shipping. The ensuing actions would settle the question of command and ought, unless our concentration has been faulty, to leave us victorious since we are in a position to bring superior force to bear. Therefore we must assume that the German navy cannot, in normal conditions, protect German trade.

Can it then play a rôle useful to its own country in attacking our oversea trade? Since it cannot hope to control the trade routes, this attack must be sporadic and pelagic; but that is not to say that, even with those limitations, it may not inflict

* Corbett, p. 138.

such damage upon our shipping that war rates of insurance would rise to a point which would kill our imports of raw material and so produce in our manufacturing districts a condition of sudden unemployment on a large scale which might well affect our further prosecution of the war. To take an instance of what we mean, we will specify the iron industry in England, which largely depends on the free import of cheap iron ore from Spain. The capture of a few ships freighted with iron ore would probably send up the insurance rates to 5 per cent. At first sight this seems very little, but it would effectually stop the importation of iron ore, since a 5 per cent. rate on the ship each way and on the cargo one way, would amount to a 105 per cent. rate on the total value of the cargo, and the iron industry cannot be continued if the price of its raw material is suddenly doubled. As we have already stated, we believe that the serious menace to British shipping in war time is to be found in the sustained action of converted merchant ships able to keep the sea for a long time owing to the supply of coal carried in their holds to replenish their bunkers, rather than in the direct action of the enemy's cruisers. But these latter have an indirect rôle before them of great importance. It is that of preventing our cruisers from turning their attention to the destruction of the enemy's converted merchantmen who are attacking our commerce. To hunt down hostile commerce destroyers, which are themselves scattered, our cruisers need to be dispersed over wide areas: this dispersion will be dangerous if a squadron or squadrons of hostile cruisers appear on the scene: therefore if our enemy sends his cruisers to sea in such squadrons he may force upon our commerce-protecting cruisers a concentration which will leave hostile commerce-destroyers free to prey on our trade. This is a line of reasoning which is deducible from Admiral Mahan's remarks* on the rôle played in 1812 by Commodore Rodger's squadron, which, at a critical moment, by forcing concentration on our frigates and corvettes, relieved American trade from the attack of our cruisers on the American station.

Given the comparatively small steaming capacity of men-of-war and the fact that Germany possesses no suitable oversea bases where her squadrons can coal and refit in security, we do not see that the German navy can do much to hurt our commerce by direct action on the trade routes, since such direct action cannot be sustained. Should Germany become possessed of such a base as Walfisch Bay would become in her hands, the

* Mahan, 'Naval Strategy,' pp. 249–250.

complexion of the problem changes. If we are at war with the Triple Alliance and not with Germany alone, the British Mediterranean squadron, or as the case may be, the British and French Mediterranean squadrons, will find in that sea some seventeen hostile battleships, thirteen armoured cruisers, sixteen protected cruisers, fifty-three torpedo-boat destroyers and twenty-seven submarines belonging to Austria and Italy—a force sufficiently powerful to ensure that the command of the Mediterranean will have to be fought for. The struggle for supremacy in the inland sea may well be both long and arduous; during its continuance the uncommanded waters of the Mediterranean will not afford safe passage to our Eastern and Australian trade, which, in all probability, will be forced to use the Cape route. In this event it has been calculated that an observer posted at some spot between Cape Town and Plymouth would see passing him one British merchantship every half hour, so dense will be the flow of shipping either way. When we remember that such a point can be found not more than a few hours' steaming from Walfisch Bay, it will help us to realise what a terrible menace to British commerce that harbour would become if Germany is ever allowed to possess it and to make of it a Port Arthur, affording shelter, coal and supplies to her fleet. Such an event would force upon us what Mr. Corbett would call, and rightly so, a war with a limited object, for the capture of Walfisch Bay, while our adversary is left free to wage against us a war with an unlimited object, our national downfall, on a theatre of war which may be in the Continent of Europe or in the British Isles.

Another rôle the German navy might be called upon to play is to prevent the landing of an expeditionary force on the coasts of Germany, be that force purely British or one reinforced from the army of some Power in alliance with us. Can the German fleet play a part in some degree commensurate with its cost in frustrating such an enterprise? The answer to this question must be that, given the nature of the German coasts and the efficiency of their defence by torpedo, mine and battery, such an operation would be unpromising even if we suppose the German fleet eliminated from the calculation of the chances for and against success. When, further, we take into account the fact that no such operation can contribute to the final issue of the war, which is only to be sought in the defeat of the German field armies, and that since Germany is a nation in arms any diversion on her coasts can but draw upon itself a vastly superior force of well-trained Landwehr and other second line troops, not required for the purposes of

the decisive struggle on the land frontiers of the Empire, we are forced to conclude that it is not in order to guard against so unreal a danger that Germany has submitted to the financial burden of creating the second navy in Europe in addition to maintaining the first army on the Continent. Granted that the German navy is a factor in preventing England from landing her small expeditionary force at any point east of the Straits of Dover, it cannot prevent her doing so west of those narrow seas which can be controlled by the British fleet, if any seas in the world can be controlled. Japan in 1904 has shown it was possible to control, for a similar purpose, a wider maritime area, the Yellow Sea from the Straits of Tsushima to Pitsewo.

Evidently the purpose for which the German navy has been created is neither defence of the German coasts nor defence of German trade—for the former purpose it is unnecessary, and for the second it is inadequate. We have seen that it has a part to play, though one strictly limited owing to lack of oversea bases, in assisting German commerce destroyers to prey on British oversea trade. But that, in itself, is not an adequate reason for the creation of a navy which diverts from the army, the sole guarantee of German nationality and independence, money which might be spent on army corps available for war on the French and Russian frontiers. We have given our reasons for believing the German navy to be at present too weak to wrest from us command of the sea unless our statesmen commit themselves to a foolish and adventurous foreign policy, or unless our Admiralty blunders sadly, which we have no grounds for anticipating.

The only rôle left to the German navy in a war with England, if our appreciation of the situation be correct, is to make possible an invasion of these islands, enabling her to gather, in the very heart of the British Empire, the untold fruits of a successful war waged with an unlimited objective. This postulates as the rôle of the German navy such action as will make possible invasion over an uncommanded sea on which a superior fleet is in being. To this question Mr. Corbett devotes a reasoned and illuminating chapter. His conclusion is that such an operation is not feasible. We gather that Admiral Mahan, in the main, agrees with Mr. Corbett, for he lays it down that 'as a rule, a major operation of war across sea should not be 'attempted, unless naval superiority for an adequate period 'is probable.'* He reminds us indeed, and to some extent

* Mahan, 'Naval Strategy,' p. 218.

this qualifies the dictum we have quoted above, that great maritime expeditions have crossed uncommanded seas and reached their objective when he tells us to bear in mind that 'it did happen in 1798, under the greatest General of modern 'times, and that the expedition was pursued by Nelson, one 'of the greatest Admirals of all time.'* Still, in spite of this slight qualification of the thesis that such an operation is not possible, we feel that on this point Admiral Mahan is at one with Mr. Corbett; at any rate, we feel sure that both these authorities would be agreed that to transport an invading force across an uncommanded sea on which an efficient fleet of superior strength is free to operate is, to say the least of it, an unpromising operation of war. We feel that where Mr. Corbett might be led to assert that it is as an operation impossible, Admiral Mahan would confine himself to the statement that it is unpromising. For ourselves we are content to say that, however much recognised authorities, such as Mr. Corbett and Admiral Mahan, may agree or may differ as to whether the operation is 'impossible' or only 'unpromising,' we feel sure that it is in a belief in its feasibility that we must seek the *raison d'être* of the German navy. By a process of elimination we are led to conclude that a navy which can neither command the sea nor protect its own commerce; whose rôle in attacking our oversea trade is subsidiary to that of its commerce destroyers; and which is unnecessary to prevent invasion of its own home country, can only have been created at great sacrifice in order to make possible invasion of these islands. That is to say, that the German navy has no place in modern war except in a war of aggression against England; this is tantamount to saying that for Germany, a great, if not the greatest, land Power, a navy is 'in the nature of a luxury,' as Mr. Churchill told his audience at Glasgow. If this is true, we hope that our statesmen will see to it that the British fleet, irrespective of what party may be in office, may always be maintained at such a strength as will ensure that, for purposes of aggression, the German navy is inadequate, whatever additions may be made to its strength now or in the future. This will entail upon us yet further sacrifices, but we are confident that they will be made willingly, if not cheerfully, so long as we remember, as Admiral Mahan tells us, that 'the 'power to control Germany does not exist in Europe except 'in the British navy.'†

* Mahan, 'Naval Strategy,' p. 208.

† Ibid. p. 109.

Art. XI.—HOME RULE OR A UNITED KINGDOM.

1. *The King's Speech on Opening Parliament.* February 1912.
2. *The Framework of Home Rule.* By Erskine Childers, author of 'The Riddle of the Sands,' etc. London: Edward Arnold. 1911.
3. *The Finance of Irish Government.* By the Right Hon. Lord MacDonnell of Swinford, G.C.S.I. 'Nineteenth Century,' January 1912.
4. *A History of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century.* By W. E. H. Lecky. 5 vols. London: Longmans. 1909.
5. *Gladstone and Ireland: the Irish Policy of Parliament from* 1850 *to* 1894. By Lord Eversley. London: Methuen. 1912.

A Liberal Government once more and for the third time has announced its intention to amend the 'Provision for the 'Government of Ireland,' to use the famous title given by Mr. Gladstone to his portentous Bill of 1886, for separating the Parliaments of Great Britain and Ireland. Since those days two Sovereigns and five Prime Ministers have passed away. The threatened Union, it is true, still stands; but the declarations made in His Majesty's Speech at the opening of the present session have disclosed the intention of Mr. Asquith to employ the whole strength of his Party to let it stand no longer, and to make the passing of a new Home Rule Bill the first and principal legislative achievement of a Parliament which differs in much besides mere party complexion from every Parliament of the United Kingdom or of Great Britain which has preceded it.

To quote the language put into the mouth of His Majesty: 'A measure for the better Government of Ireland will be sub-'mitted to you. A Bill will be laid before you to terminate the 'Establishment of the Church in Wales. Proposals will be 'brought forward for the amendment of the law with respect 'to the Franchise and Registration of Electors.' Thus the Government proposes to repeal the Union, to disestablish a Church, and to pass a Reform Bill in a single session! Mere proposals indeed, however wild, lie within the constitutional competence of the Prime Minister and his colleagues; but the disposal of events being clearly outside their control, it may be permitted to us to doubt whether many experienced politicians took His Majesty's Speech quite seriously as a programme of

work to be immediately accomplished, and did not rather regard it as a party manifesto mainly designed to encourage the zeal of the various groups of members in the House of Commons upon whose union in the Lobby the ministerial majority is dependent.

It is not, however, the sole duty of a British Ministry to pay regard to party considerations, or even to make sweeping and fundamental changes in the laws and constitution of their country. It has to *govern*—that is to say it is for the time being responsible for peace, order, and good government within the United Kingdom. It has to see that the freedom of British subjects according to law is duly protected, that is that they are safeguarded in person, and in property, and in the exercise of their lawful rights. More than this: if unforeseen circumstances should threaten danger, grievous injury, or disaster to the national welfare, men look, and have a right to look, to the advisers of the King for counsel and guidance in time of their country's peril.

For nearly two months past the thoughts of the public have been concentrated on the difficulties and dangers involved in the dissensions between capital and labour culminating in the strike of all the coalminers of the kingdom against their employers. It has been the intention of the miners' leaders to enforce their own terms on all employers by the threat that unless they are granted they will not only stop the coal trade itself, but will also paralyse all industries dependent upon coal by refusing its supply, thus 'holding up' every trade, and at the same time starving the general public by the denial of fuel almost as necessary to it as its food. This threat they have been actually able in great measure to carry out. Parliament has been asked by the Prime Minister, after exhausting in vain every effort to get employers and employed to agree together, to regulate the terms of employment in the mining industry by the laws of the realm, and to give statutory authority to what is known as a minimum wage. How far the proposals of the Ministry and the action of the House of Commons have satisfied the miners, and so put an end to the strike, it is at the time we write impossible to decide; but at best the whole situation is as unpleasant as it is unprecedented. What is the truth? Is it Parliament that has been imposing its will on the miners and the coalowners or the miners who have been imposing their will on Parliament? Till something like a return to industrial peace, the resumption of trade, and the protection of the general interests of the public have been secured, the Ministry will undoubtedly be supported in almost any course they may

on their responsibility recommend to meet the emergency. The time for considering impartially and fully in these pages the meaning and causes of such great industrial catastrophes as the railway strike of last summer, and the miners' strike of the present spring, and our future policy with regard to the threat of similar deadlocks has not yet arrived. Some remedy, some prevention must be sought, and assuredly there is no subject which demands so urgently the earnest and immediate attention of our statesmen and Parliament. The Government it must be remembered has not ventured to declare that in its belief legislation fixing the amount of wages in one of the largest and best paid industries of the country is in itself desirable; or to deny that such legislation may not improbably open the door to formidable consequences. Ministers have asked Parliament in a time of national stress to pass an 'Emergency Bill'; the operation of which they have accordingly limited to three years. They are better able than the general public to measure the greatness of the emergency. Placed before the House of Commons in this way Parliament has done well to pass the Bill. Nevertheless the public has taken note of all the surrounding circumstances, and is by no means satisfied that sufficient firmness and determination have been shown, apart altogether from the merits of their Emergency Bill, in resisting unlawful and entirely unjustifiable coercion. The miners have threatened, and to a large extent have enforced their threat, not merely against their employers but against the general public; and the latter would have rejoiced to hear in unmistakable tones that the Government intended to use every means at their disposal in its defence. On behalf of the strikers the most outrageous language has been used. The soldiers, if called out to suppress riot and defend the freedom of men to work for their own livelihood and in the public interests, have been called upon to mutiny; they were to be resisted, it seems, if they enabled the railways to continue to provide the towns with the necessaries of life. An enemy at our gates could hardly have threatened more! A few strong words from a leading minister of the Crown would not only have reassured the public, but would have called forth a demonstration on the side of the guardians of public order which would have greatly strengthened their hands in a time of 'emergency.'

It may well be that in such times difficulty and delay, unforeseen at the opening of the session, will be imposed upon Parliament in bringing to accomplishment the vast legislative programme announced in the King's Speech. The nation may, therefore, be compelled to bear upon its conscience for some

months longer the burden of the Established Church in Wales; and even to endure a short prolongation of the Parliamentary Union between Great Britain and Ireland. But inasmuch as the Establishment has existed since the dawn of history, and the Union for a dozen years over a century, it really would seem to matter little whether the abatement of these two nuisances takes place a few months sooner or later. And time will hardly be wasted by postponing the consideration of such far-reaching legislative projects till men can give them whole-hearted attention. It will however be a real misfortune if the Government does not this session present its Home Rule Bill to Parliament.

In 1886 Mr. Gladstone made Home Rule the 'first plank in the platform' of the Liberal party. In April he and his Cabinet laid before the House of Commons his whole policy as regards Ireland, in two great Bills; and Liberals who refused to accept the policy he had sprung upon them, necessarily then and there severed their connexion with their old leader. Though Mr. Gladstone was defeated in the House of Commons and in the country, he was successful in keeping Home Rule in the first place in the programme of his party; and accordingly when he was again in a majority another Home Rule Bill (in 1893) was brought forward, differing, it is true, in important respects from its predecessor, but which nevertheless proved equally unfortunate in winning British approval. Nineteen years have since elapsed without any attempt on the part of responsible Liberal statesmen to give form and substance to their Home Rule aspirations. Mr. Gladstone is the only British statesman who has as yet ventured to introduce a Home Rule Bill. His two efforts in that direction were the two great failures of his long, distinguished, and, on the whole, useful career. That policy which he had persuaded Liberal caucuses and a majority of his old followers to adopt, proved the ruin of his party, and so discredited it with the majority of his countrymen that its opponents were placed and maintained in power for best part of a generation.

Once more, and for the third time, the policy of the repeal of the Union has become the first and immediate object, as well as the principal end, for which the Liberal party professes to strive. Once more that policy is about to take upon itself the form of an Act of Parliament. In that case Home Rule again becomes something more than a phrase. It developes into a tangible plan for the future government of the British Islands. Where Mr. Gladstone failed in convincing the British people, it is hardly to be expected *prima facie* that Mr. Asquith

will succeed. The former, it will be remembered, tried in several different ways to shape his policy; but in whatever fashion it took concrete form it met with whole-hearted repudiation. The old difficulties, obstacles, impossibilities and absurdities, which were too much for Mr. Gladstone, still bar the way for his successor. Stern facts are there which cannot be ignored, and which neither declamation nor dialectics can do away with. The strength of the Unionist case has not diminished with the lapse of years. Indeed, such changes as have taken place with reference to Ireland in that time have given additional force to the reasoning upon which Lord Hartington, Lord Goschen, and Mr. Chamberlain rested their defence of the Union twenty-six and nineteen years ago. Why then should there be any danger of the acceptance at the present day of that policy which has already been so completely exposed and ignominiously rejected? Are Parliament and the country less able than they were at the end of the nineteenth century to protect themselves against unwise and dangerous legislation which the leaders of a party majority may wish to pass?

In our opinion, unfortunately they are. The House of Commons has become the subservient instrument of the Executive Government. Its members appear to have lost all spirit of independence, all sense of individual responsibility, except to party and to caucus. When history takes account of the good and bad work done by recent Ministries it will pass no slight censure upon statesmen who directly or indirectly have been largely responsible for lowering the character of the House of Commons. Mechanical divisions, and unreal debates almost as mechanical, are diminishing rapidly the respect in which that great assembly used to be held. The House of Lords has been deprived of a large part of its legislative authority. And so incompetent, in the eyes of many Englishmen, has Parliament become to perform its high function of a supreme representative legislature, that a cry is raised for the introduction of that most unparliamentary of institutions a popular referendum. With Parliament in this condition, what about the People? In accordance with our old British system, Parliament and People both played their appropriate parts in the great Home Rule controversies of former years. 'Thank God we have a House 'of Lords!' was the exclamation of a former Radical, when by its means and in the old constitutional fashion a great policy was referred to the electorate. It is, we repeat, unlikely that Mr. Asquith should carry conviction where Mr. Gladstone failed to do so. But is it necessary to-day for the Prime Minister

to convince anyone at all? His power is not limited, as was that of Mr. Gladstone, by a House of Commons which required convincing, by a House of Peers, or by the people. For the time being Parliamentary and constitutional methods are largely in abeyance. And it is little less than a scandal that under such conditions an endeavour should be made to force through a policy of the most momentous and far-reaching importance—a policy hitherto defeated and discredited—by the mere brute-power of a temporary majority of the House of Commons.

In our belief Ministers are steering the ship of State directly upon the rocks. That is what breaking up the Union means. Twice already has the strong sense of the country saved it from the blind recklessness of party leaders who had forgotten that they were statesmen. Twice it was forced to choose between its own shipwreck and the refusal of power to a statesman for whom it had felt deep reverence and enthusiastic admiration. The British people could in truth never bring themselves to accept that policy which had become the object of the passionate attachment of Mr. Gladstone's old age. Little danger, it is true, is to be apprehended to-day from the violent enthusiasm for Home Rule on the part of His Majesty's Ministers. But it is undeniable that party interests are at stake. Mr. Redmond and his followers will content themselves no longer with that mere lip-service to Home Rule beyond which for the last nineteen years English Liberals have not advanced. And so once more the phrase is to become a Bill. We shall see before long what comes of it.

It is a remarkable fact that in the long history of the Irish Home Rule question in England there seems to have been no sort of an approach amongst Liberals to an understanding of what they mean by Home Rule. Liberal leaders appear to have abandoned the attempt to lead or guide public opinion in this matter. They make indeed many speeches in which the old phrase 'Home Rule' figures. 'Irishmen must be allowed 'to manage their own affairs' we are continually reminded. Beyond this platitude they feel they cannot safely venture. To-day a majority calling itself a Home Rule majority is in possession of the House of Commons. It has accepted all the phrases and platitudes, but has never seen a Bill. Now, therefore, ministers can produce their plan—a scheme hitherto non-existent or kept concealed. For this plan, it is said, they will have the effrontery to declare that the country has given them 'a mandate'! The Bill may be riddled in debate; there may be no time to discuss large portions of it;

it may in many respects, without further threshing out, be hardly intelligible. All this does not affect the working of the modern parliamentary 'machine.' By a certain date the measure, debated or undebated, intelligible or not, is to be passed by the House of Commons. That is the way things are done at present. Party necessities come first. Better pass a bad Bill than that 'the party' should receive a rebuff! Talk about abolishing the House of Lords! Is the House of Commons also to surrender its high legislative functions, and whilst retaining formally its old place in the legislature to leave the responsibility and the real business of making and passing great constitutional laws to the Executive Government?

Whilst, however, Home Rule statesmen and responsible politicians have been for so many years exceedingly reticent in expressing any definite ideas which they may have formed on the matter, we must express our gratitude to those few more independent inquirers who have been honestly trying to think the matter out, and to instruct the public as to practicable methods of carrying the policy into effect. Mr. Erskine Childers has at least set a good example in presenting the public with his elaborate volume—'The Framework of Home Rule.' He has been struck, as any honest inquirer must be, with the portentous difficulties that would be introduced into the government of Ireland and of the United Kingdom by the acceptance of any form of Gladstonian Home Rule—the Bill of 1886 or that of 1893. He has moreover been deeply impressed by the lesson to be learned from the establishment of parliamentary government in the British Colonies; and he finds in the examples of Canada, Australia, and South Africa the true and only possible solution of the Irish question. In the opinion of Mr. Childers, Ireland ought to be, not a portion of the United Kingdom at all, but a colony with complete powers of self-government. Indeed, he considers that in fact Ireland always has been and now is 'a colony,' to which the colonising island—Great Britain—unwisely and unjustly refuses separate parliamentary government.

Let us be on our guard against false analogies. In the days of Gladstonian Home Rule, Unionists were exhorted to consider the examples of Austria-Hungary, of Norway and Sweden, of Denmark and Iceland! In the present year we expect to hear a good deal less of the foreigner and more of our kinsmen beyond the seas. By all means let us learn where we can; but it is as well to remember that there are considerable differences between the cases of Ireland and of Iceland, and that

even the cases of Ireland and of South Africa are hardly 'on 'all fours.' Mr. Childers pours scorn upon the foolish Unionist who comments, 'Ah, but Ireland is so near!' Well, it may be very unreasonable; but throughout history and to our times *the map* has had much to answer for. Mr. Childers would make of Ireland a sister nation like the Dominion of Canada. Indeed, we are not sure that he would not go further. There is no danger, he thinks, to be apprehended.

'We guarantee the independent existence of the kingdom of Belgium, which is as near as Ireland, with military liabilities vastly more serious than any which Ireland could conceivably entail; but we do not claim, as a consequence, to control the Executive of Belgium and remove her parliament to Westminster, in order to be quite sure that the Belgians are not intriguing against us with Germany.' *

Again we share the feelings of the 'moderate average Unionist,' and can only exclaim 'The map! The map!'

Neighbourhood and distance having nothing to do with the matter, it need hardly surprise us that Mr. Childers should think it wise to treat Ireland and New Zealand in the same way. They are both 'colonies.' It is nevertheless probably a little startling to a couple of million of Irishmen, who had fancied they were as much citizens of the United Kingdom as Mr. Childers himself, to discover that they are colonists like the New Zealanders, and have no interest outside Ireland in the affairs of the kingdom. They are Irishmen, and as such are to be told to manage their own affairs and not to meddle with other high matters which Englishmen and Scotchmen will exclusively control. Mr. Childers would exclude *all* representatives of Ireland from Westminster. Ireland should, he declares, be free from any obligation to contribute to the defence or the general purposes of the Empire. If Ireland wants full colonial powers over an army and navy of her own she should have them; but he tells us, on whose authority is not apparent, that 'Ireland does not want separate armaments.' She should be enabled to raise a separate volunteer force, and would of course have control of constabulary and police, whilst the Home Government would on the other hand retain the command of British troops quartered in Ireland, and apparently of certain specified camps, arsenals, and dockyards.

Thoroughly consistent to the New Zealand analogy, Mr. Childers would make Ireland absolutely mistress of her own finance. 'Finance and policy are inseparably one. All the

* The Framework of Home Rule, p. 147.

'considerations which render Home Rule desirable lead 'irresistibly to the financial independence of Ireland, with 'complete control assigned to her over all branches of taxation. 'Without financial independence it is impossible to realise the 'objects of Home Rule.' * Our main object, he tells us, is to make Ireland self-reliant. At the present time she gains over a million a year by her connexion with Great Britain, who pays this virtual annual subsidy to Ireland whilst bearing on her own shoulders the whole of Imperial expenses for army and navy. This subsidy 'must stop, and the sooner the better,' says Mr. Childers, cautiously adding that 'it is of vital im- 'portance that Ireland should understand the situation.' We thought the Irish Nationalist view was that as a result of the Union Ireland was being bled to death in the interest of Great Britain!

Mr. Childers declares that 'no one would seriously propose 'to encumber the new Ireland with an old debt.' But the National Debt was not incurred for the advantage of England and Scotland only; any more than are army and navy to-day maintained and employed entirely for British and non-Irish purposes. However, the old debt—that is, the existing National Debt, is to be placed on the shoulders not of 'Young Ireland' but of old Britain—always, of course, on the New Zealand model; for who would think of making a New Zealander responsible for British Consols? Similarly Irish Customs and Excise are to be dismissed from Westminster and to be placed entirely under the control of the Dublin Parliament.

'Belief in Home Rule seems to me necessarily to involve a willingness to give Ireland her customs. Great Britain has no moral right to lay it down that her views about trade shall govern the course of Irish policy; and if Great Britain believes sincerely in Home Rule, she should be willing to trust Ireland, regardless of the economic consequences, and regardless of the effect upon the great Tariff controversy.' †

It appears to us that, according to Mr. Childers, Great Britain has no moral, legal, or equitable rights of any kind where Ireland is concerned. 'Justice to Ireland demands the dis- 'solution of the fiscal Union.' Freedom, we are assured, is a greater good than Free Trade. It is evident that if these are the views of the Liberal party, English Home Rulers have advanced a good deal in their ideas since Mr. Gladstone's day.

---

* Framework of Home Rule, p. 280.

† Ibid. p. 289.

They are now prepared to establish Ireland as a 'sister nation,' trusting to sisterly affection to keep the relationship a pleasant one! No good Gladstonian in old days would have ventured to advocate in the House of Commons, in his leader's presence, the 'repeal of the Union.' Nothing was further than that from Mr. Gladstone's expressed intention. So it used to be said—strangely enough, when one remembers his actual proposals! There are Liberal Home Rulers to-day who are more frank. They advocate a more complete 'repeal' than was ever dreamt of by O'Connell. Are they prepared to go still further and to accept, regardless of consequences, complete national separation. 'No man has a right,' said Mr. Parnell in words accepted by Irish Nationalists as the expression of the foundation principle of their cause, 'to fix the 'boundary of the march of a Nation.' Surely the reasoning of our Home Rule friends is as flimsy as paper. It involves shutting the eyes to indisputable fact. It is unwise to ignore the map; but it is sheer madness to ignore the fundamental character of the British people. Englishmen are doing a great disservice both to Great Britain and to Ireland who profess, or pretend to think, that the disintegration of the United Kingdom into distinct nations can ever be an open question with loyal British subjects in any part of the British Isles. To the demand of Irish Nationalists to set up a separate and independent nation the answer must be, and will be, 'No.'

We have been content so far to give the conclusions at which such a sincere Home Ruler as Mr. Childers has arrived, without examining very particularly the reasons upon which he has built. Later on we shall compare these conclusions with the very different ones reached by other Home Rulers no less sincere. It seems to be common ground with all of them that the Union has been an injury and a misfortune to Ireland; and indeed that any connexion which has existed between the two British Islands has been disastrous to the smaller one, except during the very few years when Ireland possessed something more or less resembling a free representative and national Parliament—which, however, even then did not possess that control of the Executive government which by Englishmen is considered an essential attribute of a real Parliament. History gives little confirmation to this view. In the past Ireland has undergone much suffering. The treatment of Catholics by Protestants with whom power lay was abominable; just as in those countries where Catholics were in the ascendant the treatment of

Protestants by Catholics was abominable. The selfish and ignorant protectionism, the narrow-minded trade jealousies of England inflicted at a later date much injury on Ireland. But these things are past and gone. We are now advanced well into the second century of the Union, and throughout that time it is impossible to deny that Ireland has enjoyed far better and juster government than during any previous period of her history. It is the invariable practice of Home Rule advocates to shut their eyes to palpable existing facts. We are *not* dealing with New Zealand but with Ireland. We are *not* dealing with the Ireland of the eighteenth but with the Ireland of the twentieth century. We are dealing *not* with a proposal to bring into one great nation separate states of some huge continent which desire closer union; but with a proposal to disjoin politically two small and neighbouring islands, which possess, for the most part, common interests, and the consequences of whose geographical separation have been very greatly diminished for practical purposes by the advances, inventions, and habits of our modern civilisation.

Mr. Childers cannot help admitting that at the present time the financial relations between the three Kingdoms show that Ireland is greatly favoured at the expense of England and Scotland. Neither can it be denied that under the Act of Union Ireland enjoys to-day a far larger proportionate representation in the House of Commons than is enjoyed by England or Scotland. Financially the situation has become much more favourable to Ireland than when the 'Financial Relations 'Commission' reported in 1896. That Report was very carefully examined in the Edinburgh Review of January, 1897, to which we would refer anyone who believes that Union finance has been unfair to the smaller island. As a matter of fact some four millions a year of direct taxes are imposed on inhabitants of Great Britain which are not imposed upon dwellers in Ireland. The Irishman and the Englishman pay exactly the same taxes upon the same commodities; but inasmuch as whisky, tobacco, and tea are proportionately more largely consumed in Ireland than in Great Britain, it is argued that 'Ireland,' though not the individual Irishman, is unfairly taxed. The same may be said of a poor and especially a whisky-drinking district of Great Britain if compared with a richer district. The former pays proportionately more in indirect and less in direct taxation; but as in the last few years a larger amount of taxation has been levied by direct taxes, the grievance such as it is has been largely diminished. Inasmuch

as there was no dispute, even in 1897, that the Irishman per head only contributed in taxes 1*l.* 8*s.* 10*d.* whilst the Briton paid per head 2*l.* 4*s.* 10*d.*, it was not easy for Home Rulers, however willing, to make much capital out of the alleged extortionate treatment of Ireland by the Parliament of the United Kingdom!

We turn for a moment from Mr. Childers to another Home Ruler, Lord MacDonnell of Swinford.* Now Lord MacDonnell is an able Irishman of a practical turn of mind, and he by no means sees eye to eye with English Home Rule theorists. It is doubtful whether he is at all anxious to place constitutionally, within the kingdom, Irishman and New Zealander on the same plane! At all events the very *last* thing he wishes to see is 'Fiscal Autonomy for Ireland.' As a mere matter of business he asks how is the 120,000,000*l.* to be raised to complete the land purchase scheme:

'that great measure of appeasement and conciliation—the greatest remedial measure by far ever undertaken for the good of Ireland. No one,' he continues, 'who knows Ireland thinks that this remaining sum could be borrowed by Ireland on her own responsibility except on usurious terms. . . . The land purchase operations must, then, be completed by the Imperial Treasury; and if so, it will rightly insist that the British taxpayers shall be free from risks. With Ireland under a system of fiscal autonomy, I do not see how that freedom is to be secured beyond doubt, as it now is.'

Lord MacDonnell sees, as clearly as Mr. Childers does, that fiscal autonomy for Ireland involves the exclusion from Westminster of all Irish representatives—a prospect that in this case the Englishman welcomes, but which very naturally the Irishman warmly resents.

'I am an Irishman, anxious to promote the prosperity and independence of Ireland within the Empire; but I say without hesitation, that if we Irishmen are not to participate in the Imperial Parliament, if we are to have no claim in any circumstances on Great Britain in the future, if the sole badge of our connexion with the United Kingdom is to be the obligation of obedience to orders reversing our legislative or administrative action, then I fear we are preparing for Ireland, in the not distant future, a path of doubt and isolation as thorny as any she has yet trodden.'

No one according to the very bold statement of Lord MacDonnell 'proposes to repeal the Union.' His plan is the devolution of similar and equal powers to subordinate English, Scotch, Irish, and Welsh legislatures, with a Parliament for the United

* See Nineteenth Century, January 1912.

Kingdom over them all; and how he asks could separate fiscal systems in each be made compatible with the solidarity of the whole. Therefore he would retain the control of national finance in the hands of the Supreme Parliament.

Thus Lord MacDonnell will have none of this New Zealand treatment for his native country. Instead of settling the Irish problem it would, he feels sure, make things far worse than they are. Yet Mr. Childers must not be too summarily dismissed. He argues his position with sincerity, and not a little logic. He insists that anything in the nature of 'Federal 'Home Rule' is out of the question, at present at all events. England, he observes, has not yet begun to dream of a separate English legislature; and no one yet has proposed a new Imperial Parliament as a substitute for the present one. Even if England and Scotland formed one joint provincial legislature, and Ireland another, there would still be required 'above those 'two subordinate legislatures a new Imperial Parliament 'representing the whole realm!' Three Parliaments are the very minimum that the simplest federation would require; and Mr. Childers feels sure that no Home Rule Bill will contemplate more than two, viz. an Imperial and an Irish Parliament.

'Nor can the coming Home Rule Bill for Ireland make any preparation, technically, for a general Federation. Morally it might have an important effect in stimulating local sentiment, not only in England, Scotland and Wales, but in Ireland towards a general Federation in the future, but in its mechanical structure it must be not merely non-Federal but anti-Federal. One often hears it carelessly pro-'pounded that Irish Home Rule, so devised as to be applicable in later years, if they so desire, to Scotland, Wales and England will give us by smooth mechanical means a General Federation. This is a fallacy. At one stage or another, the earliest or the latest, we should have to create a totally new central Parliament, still elected by the whole people, but exclusively devoted to Imperial affairs, and wholly exempt from local business, before we possessed anything in the nature of a Federation. But whatever the future has in store, it would be a scandal if Irish Home Rule were to be hampered or delayed by the existence of Scotch or Welsh claims, and it is earnestly to be hoped that no action of that kind will be taken. The case of Ireland is centuries old, and more urgent than ever. It differs radically from any case that can possibly be made for Scotland and Wales.' *

All this is interesting and instructive, and we share with Mr. Childers the belief that to contemplate the reconstruction

* Framework of Home Rule, p. 200.

of the United Kingdom into a Federation is, for the reasons he gives and for many others, mere dreaming. Nevertheless it is a dream indulged in, as we shall see, by many British Home Rulers. Mr. Childers' plan is no doubt, at all events on paper, a far simpler one. Establish a Parliament at Dublin, and withdraw the Irish members entirely from Westminster. The former body, he says, will be a local and territorial body only ; 'like those of the Colonies.' 'It will be the creature of the 'Parliament at Westminster, and could be amended or even 'extinguished by it in a subsequent Act.' Is this really at all 'like the Colonies'? Imagine the Parliament at Westminster suppressing the Parliament of the Dominion of Canada or of the Australian Commonwealth! The words of Mr. John Bright in 1887, ever a true friend of Ireland, show to our mind a much riper wisdom. 'I do not discuss the question 'of a little more or less of a Parliament in Dublin. A 'Parliament is a great weapon if once created and opened ; 'not difficult to form, but dangerous to deal with and 'suppress.'

So far we have dealt with the views as to Irish Home Rule held by an Englishman and an Irishman—both men of experience, who have given serious consideration to the subject. Have we anything to learn from the conception of Irish Home Rule as it presents itself to the Scottish mind? We are of course referring only to the ideas of the Scottish supporters of a Home Rule policy for Ireland ; the great weight of Scottish instructed opinion, however ready to welcome some local devolution of administrative powers in each of the three Kingdoms, being, we are convinced, entirely averse to any kind of disintegration of the single political nationality of Great Britain and Ireland.

An instructive little debate took place in the House of Commons early in the present session.* A Scottish member moved that Home Rule legislation for Ireland should be followed during the existence of the *present Parliament* 'by the granting 'of *similar powers of self-government to Scotland* as part of a 'general scheme of devolution.' This motion was supported on behalf of the Government by the Secretary for Scotland, and carried ; though not till after a good deal of scorn had very naturally been poured upon the whole discussion by Scottish Unionists, who declared with truth that Scottish Home Rule was a policy that had not been seriously considered by the Scottish people. It had been taken up by a

* Times report, 29th of February 1912.

few Scottish politicians of little importance, and had been encouraged by Ministers and their partisans not in consequence of its intrinsic merits, but as a mere party expedient likely to help them in defeating Unionist opposition to the Irish Bill.

However this may be, a few Scottish members have had the courage to do that which the Irish Nationalist party has always shrunk from doing. They have embodied their own ideas of Home Rule in a Bill. It need hardly be said that this Bill is not framed upon the New Zealand example so dear to Mr. Childers. Scotland, including those who call themselves Scottish Home Rulers, intends to remain not only part of the Empire but, like England, part of the United Kingdom also. The Scottish people would feel it as the grossest—indeed as an almost inconceivable—insult that they should be told not to meddle with the general and highest interests of Great Britain, and be excluded from the Parliament at Westminster. The Englishman who would suggest that the ancient kingdom of Scotland would best consider its own welfare by assuming the character of a colony had better in his own interest abstain from crossing the Border!

The Bill proposes to establish what is called a 'Scots Parliament,' namely, a single chamber composed of elected representatives only, two to each existing constituency, excluding the Universities, and the country is to be governed by a Lord-Lieutenant, or 'Lord High Commissioner,' and by a committee of the 'Scots Privy Council' responsible to this chamber. This 'Parliament' is to have power to legislate on all Scotch local matters described in some two-and-twenty sub-sections of Clause IX; but is restrained from legislating with respect to the military, naval, or territorial forces, the making of peace or war, or foreign or colonial relations. It is empowered to impose taxation other than duties of Customs and Excise, and the proceeds of Scottish taxation and other public revenues are to be paid into a Scottish Consolidated Fund. Scotland is to pay an annual contribution towards the expenditure of the United Kingdom fixed at the average annual contribution of Scotland during the three years before the Act comes into force.

Of course it would be unfair to its authors to discuss, or to take very seriously, what is probably intended as a mere *ballon d'essai*. In Scotland the Bill has, as a matter of fact, called forth practically no serious discussion at all. The composition of the Parliament at Westminster is, by this remarkable effort in Constitution building, not to be interfered with, and the seventy-two Scottish members who will still find their way

there will, it is to be presumed, occupy themselves with those high and mighty matters which are withdrawn from the jurisdiction of their local fellow members. These are specified in section 10. They are: (1) The Status or Dignity of the Crown, or the Succession or a Regency. (2) Peace and War. (3) The armed forces of the Crown and Defence of the Realm. (4) Treaties and Foreign and Colonial Relations. (5) Dignities and Titles of Honour. (6) Prize or booty of War. (7) Offences against the Law of Nations, or on the High Seas. The Scottish contingent at Westminster (being the whole body of the Scottish representatives as they now exist), confined to these subjects, is likely to have a good deal of time on its hands, even though the function of imposing Customs and Excise duties is still to be performed by them. Unless of course a similar Bill is passed 'in the present Parliament' for England, the Scottish representatives will naturally continue to give the same attention as they do at present to English affairs, and will control in every direction the action of the Imperial Cabinet.

A few Scottish Home Rule members of Parliament have with characteristic courage thus rushed in where their Irish and English colleagues have feared to tread. Why did not an English representative in the debate on the 28th of February speak up for his own countrymen, and propose to extend in the present Parliament Irish Home Rule to England as well as Scotland? This backwardness by Englishmen to urge the claims of their country has tempted too many Irishmen and Scotchmen to forget that after all England is a part of the United Kingdom, and that a reconstruction of the constitution of that kingdom deserves to be looked at occasionally from an English point of view. It would be interesting to know if England also is to have appointed for her a Governor, Lord-Lieutenant, or Lord High Commissioner to exercise in local English affairs the functions at present exercised by the King. And if not, why not? Is his Majesty not as much, and as personally, King of Scotland as he is King of England? Why should the King personally be appropriated by England, and Scotland be put off with a Lord-Lieutenant? There are the names of a dozen Scotch M.P.s on the back of this 'Government of Scotland Bill' which proposes to establish in Edinburgh a representative of Royalty to rule the Ancient Kingdom after the fashion of a Dublin Lord-Lieutenant. We should greatly doubt whether it would be possible to find another dozen of Scotchmen eager to imitate in this respect the Irish example.

According to Mr. Childers (we do not agree with him) Ireland has in fact never been anything but a colony of England. But there can of course be no dispute that Scotland and England were in old days equally independent and entirely separate as kingdoms and nations. After the Crowns had been united by the falling of the English succession to the Scottish King, a century followed, and a very uncomfortable century too, throughout which each nation, though under one king, had its own Parliament. Since that time, again, more than two centuries have passed during which the two nations have been united in the same Parliament, of course owing allegiance as before to the same sovereign. It is impossible to exaggerate the blessings to both nations that have ensued from this complete Union of the Kingdoms and the Parliaments, and of the two, the smaller and the poorer country has gained the most. The equality of the citizenship of the United Kingdom, the sharing alike in its privileges and its burdens, has been the basis upon which contentment and prosperity, rare in the experience of nations, has been securely built up. It was *Union* with England, not Colonial Government, not Provincial Government, that could alone have enabled Scotland to win her present position, and heartily identify herself with England in the achievements and aspirations of the British Nation.

The parliamentary union between Great Britain and Ireland was a turning point in the history of the smaller island. Let any one read and ponder over the state of Ireland in the eighteenth century as described in Lecky's admirable volumes; and mentally contrast it with what he has read and known of the Ireland of the nineteenth century. Pitt's great act of statesmanship may not have accomplished, or have accomplished at once, all that he expected of it. It did not prevent, just as it did not cause, the Irish famine in the middle of the nineteenth century. The Union did however put an end to the danger of rebellion and civil war, as nothing else could have done. Under the working of that system every vestige of religious ascendency and privilege has been swept away. Irishmen became as safe as Englishmen or Scotchmen in their knowledge that their industries and trades would not be subjected to burdens which their fellow subjects of the United Kingdom did not share. The Protestants of the North of Ireland, greatly influenced by the doctrines of the French Revolution, and in communication with the incipient revolutionary clubs of Great Britain, had been before the rebellion of 1798 the chief centre of disaffection. The removal

of Irish grievances, remedial measures of various kinds, and liberal reforms, have made the men of Ulster as good subjects as any to be found on this side of the Irish Channel. Mr. Bright in 1886 declared in opposition to Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule policy that 'the United Parliament could be and would 'be more *just to all classes* in Ireland than any Parliament that 'could meet in Dublin under Mr. Gladstone's Bill.' It is undeniable that the United Parliament *has been* infinitely more just to Irishmen of all classes than any Parliament at Dublin ever *was*; and much more beneficent to Ireland than any such Parliament could ever be. Were Pitt to contemplate the results of his statesmanship after over a century's working of the Union system, can any one believe he would repent his policy, and endeavour to write history backwards, by reviving the previous ghastly experience of separate Irish parliamentary government? It may be that the troubles and dangers that loom so large in the eyes of modern statesmen might not seem so very formidable to William Pitt, who knew what real troubles and dangers were. He certainly would have been loth to admit in 1886, in 1893, or in 1912, that they were such as to render it impossible for Ireland to be governed like England and Scotland as part of a United Kingdom.

No one is likely to believe that Pitt's Act of Union is a final measure in the sense that it has fixed in every detail the system of Irish government for all time. Nevertheless we are absolutely convinced that any abandonment of its great principles of the equal citizenship of Englishmen, Scotchmen, and Irishmen, of their representation in one Sovereign Parliament, and of their government by one Supreme Executive would inevitably open the door to much trouble and confusion and ultimately entail national disaster. The maintenance of union is perfectly consistent with a large extension of local government, and a large delegation of administrative powers. But about these things Mr. Parnell and the Nationalist leaders have always shown themselves to be quite indifferent. In their eyes Home Rule meant the setting up of an Irish *nation* in the political sense of the word and the endowing Parliament, not with provincial but with national institutions. If it did not mean this it meant nothing. A great many English Home Rulers, we are well aware, do not mean this at all; and it would be much better if they said so; especially for Ireland! After a Home Rule Bill or before it, the same Sovereign, they tell us will govern Great Britain and Ireland. But as Lord Hartington, who looked to facts as well as words, used to ask, 'You talk about the same Sovereign; but do you mean

'the same *Sovereign Power*;' and no answer to a most pertinent question was ever forthcoming.

If on the whole the experience of the century which followed the Union has justified its policy, it is equally the case that the years that have passed since 1886 have shown the wisdom of the country in then rejecting Gladstonian Home Rule. Unionists repelled at that time with some little scorn the threat that unless Mr. Gladstone's Bills were accepted, it would be impossible to govern Ireland. They declared that order and law could be maintained, and that great and beneficial measures might be passed, under the rule of the Parliament of the United Kingdom. Time has shown that they were right. The agrarian difficulties, which as Lecky has shown were the almost inevitable result of an unhappy past, have been fairly tackled by the great policy of converting on a vast scale tenant occupiers into owners of the land—a policy rendered possible only by the financial credit of the United Kingdom. In material comfort Ireland's condition is far better than it has ever been before; though prosperity has not yet risen to such an impossible height as to deprive Irish politicians of the luxury of complaint.

Mr. Gladstone would, we know, have separated the exchequers in 1893. How then could these results have been achieved? 'The financial clauses of that Bill,' says Mr. Edgar Crammond in an able and instructive article,* 'were of 'an involved and hazardous nature which would have kept the 'two Exchequers in a continual state of conflict. Time has 'proved that they would have been unworkable; and if 'enforced they would have brought Ireland to the verge of 'bankruptcy in less than a decade.' He goes on to state that to make Home Rule financially possible the taxpayers of Great Britain must consent to make the British Exchequer responsible for the 'inevitable deficits of the Irish one'; hardly that lesson in self-reliance of which Mr. Childers thinks Ireland stands so much in need.

A former colleague of Mr. Gladstone, and a strenuous supporter of Gladstonian Home Rule, whatever form it assumed, was Mr. George Lefevre, now Lord Eversley. In his 'Glad-'stone and Ireland,' just published, he has taken a survey of the Irish Policy of Parliament from 1850 to 1894. Here at the present moment we do not intend to follow him. Once, he tells us, he ventured upon a prediction of which he is evidently proud, namely that on whatever principle a Home

* Nineteenth Century, Oct. 1911.

Rule Bill was first presented to Parliament—Colonial or Federal—the other would be ultimately adopted. 'This 'prediction seems likely to be verified. The Bill of 1886 was 'based on the Colonial principle, that of 1893 on the Federal 'principle; and this, it may be assumed, will be the basis 'of the next and final scheme.' * But Mr. Childers has just forcibly urged that the next Bill must be 'not merely non-'Federal, but anti-Federal'; and he would therefore hardly be prepared to make the assumption required to prove Lord Eversley a true prophet. Lord Eversley himself shews no preference for any particular form of Home Rule; though he is sanguine enough to expect 'finality' from a policy which appears to be only the first step in the complete reconstruction of the British Constitution. Mr. Redmond at Dublin, in a speech to a great gathering of Irish Nationalists,† does not attempt to throw light upon the kind of Home Rule which his countrymen desire. 'For himself,' and he spoke he said only for himself, 'he entertained a confident belief that the 'Home Rule Bill would be a great measure.' Upon its merits or demerits an Irish National Convention would in due time pronounce. For the measure which is to be put forward for the future government of Ireland no Irish Nationalists will make themselves responsible. What would Scottish Home Rulers say to a Bill for recasting the whole system of government in Scotland, which no Scottish representative had a share in preparing, and for which no Scotchman would take an atom of responsibility?

'The Bill,' said Mr. Redmond at Dublin, in almost immediate expectation of its introduction, 'will be adequate 'for the purpose of those who promote it.' Significant and carefully weighed words! The Irish Leader does not say that he expects it to be such as ought to satisfy Irish Nationalists and Home Rulers. They do not, nor does he, take any responsibility whatever for promoting it. If it should not satisfy their aspirations and his, it may be that their policy will resemble Mr. Parnell's, viz. to accept what is offered, and then use it as a fulcrum for obtaining more.

'When we have undermined English misgovernment'—said Mr. Parnell to a great gathering of Irish Americans at Cincinnati—'we have paved the way for Ireland to take her place among the nations of the earth. And let us not forget that that is the ultimate goal at which all we Irishmen aim. None of us, whether

* Gladstone and Ireland, p. 301.

† 31st March.

we be in America or Ireland, or wherever we may be, will be satisfied until we have destroyed the last link which keeps Ireland bound to England.'

Can anyone doubt that those words represented the unwavering purpose of the great creator and director of modern Irish Nationalism? Mr. Parnell was no stump orator, no mere mouthing rhetorician; but a man of firm and steadfast purpose, who said what he meant, and meant what he said. Hence his remarkable power over his countrymen. Many good, simple-minded English Liberals fancied that he had abandoned all these patriotic ambitions in accepting Gladstonian Home Rule. They glowed with enthusiasm in speaking of the 'historic handshake' of Lord Spencer and Mr. Parnell at the banquet of the Eighty Club! The Liberal Leader had cut the claws of Irish Nationalism, and had converted the supporters of a once dangerous movement and its formidable leader into very good and useful 'Gladstonians.' In party caucuses all this 'went down like butter,' to use a famous phrase of Lord Randolph Churchill in reference to protectionist plausibilities. But the country saw through it all, and has steadily refused to be beguiled by pretence, or driven by intimidation, into surrendering the National Unity of the Three Kingdoms.

We wonder if there are many English Home Rulers who really believe that the passing of a measure of Gladstonian Home Rule would finally settle the Irish question. The demonstrations that have lately taken place in Ulster bring very usefully before the public the intense objection of Irishmen—who, though a minority, form a considerable and noteworthy proportion of the Irish people—to being deprived of the rights of citizenship of the United Kingdom, as they are enjoyed by Englishmen and Scotchmen. If Ireland is to be turned into a colony, and yet the more numerous faction is to have behind it Imperial power in the shape of the armed forces of the Crown, we shall in effect be establishing a new ascendancy. Many loyal Irishmen feel, as Englishmen have often felt, that where the subject owes obedience to the law, he is entitled to its protection. The Sovereign Power cannot morally free itself from all duties to its subjects, whilst claiming the right to coerce them. Sir Edward Carson to-day holds the same language as Colonel Saunderson in 1893 in the House of Commons. If England insisted on making Ireland a colony that might have to be accepted; but Colonel Saunderson protested with vigour against a

supremacy which would enable 'the Irish Government to 'appeal to the Imperial Parliament for the assistance of the 'army and navy to compel the Irish minority to obey their 'behests.'* His implication appeared to be that if Ireland was indeed cut entirely adrift, the Irish minority would be able to take care of itself. But what did this mean? Hardly a peaceful settlement of Irish troubles! For our part we prefer to believe with the late Lord Goschen that 'the abandonment of the Irish loyalists' is impossible. 'Such a thing has never yet been recorded in the annals of 'history.'†

We are again approaching a great conflict over fundamental political principles. It is no mere question of a little more or less of local government in a part of the United Kingdom. Is Ireland to remain part of the United Kingdom at all? Subject to the Sovereign Power that Englishmen and Scotchmen obey? Mr. Parnell's whole career was a struggle to achieve complete national separation. That was the ultimate goal, which he never dreamt of abandoning. In labouring for such an end, we think that he was utterly misguided by his temperament and prejudices, and that, blind to the facts and conditions of his time, he wrought much mischief by inflaming racial antagonisms in pursuit of the impossible. Mistaken and misguided he was. But there is nothing morally reprehensible in his dream of a separate, independent Irish nation. More blame, surely, attaches to those Englishmen who knowing well that it is a dream yet give every encouragement to the dreamers to believe in its reality. Most English Home Rulers would grant Gladstonian Home Rule in the hope that by so doing they would defeat the great object of Irish Nationalism —complete national independence. Mr. Parnell accepted Gladstonian Home Rule in order to bring nearer that very end. Strange allies! The 'Leader of the Irish Race' understood far better than English Liberals what was intended by Irish Nationalism. He believed in Home Rule, as Mr. Asquith believes in the Parliament Act, as an instrument to be put to further use.

Are we in truth nearing the end of a long controversy? Is the first quarter of the twentieth century to see the reversal of the action of the British people in the last quarter of the nineteenth century? To us it seems that a surrender to Irish Nationalism will end nothing, but will only open the door

* Quoted by Mr. E. Childers, 'Framework of Home Rule.'
† House of Commons, 1886.

to fresh difficulties and more embittered antagonisms. The adoption of Federalism involves the throwing of the whole British constitution into the melting-pot. Mr. Erskine Childers sees that. The New Zealand plan is an injury and an insult to loyal Irishmen. Lord MacDonnell sees that. A very large and important minority of Irishmen repudiate Home Rule altogether, declaring that they will insist on their right to remain citizens of the United Kingdom. It may be possible for a Government, with newly constituted parliamentary machinery, to pass *any* Bill which a House of Commons majority deems essential to its party interests. We do not know. But as Carlyle would have said, when once you have got your new constitution the question must arise: 'Will the Constitution 'march?' Sooner or later—sooner if the country adheres to the Union, later if it is foolish enough to try the experiment of Home Rule—these controversies will be settled in conformity with the facts and conditions of our time. These demand the maintenance of the actual and undisputed sovereignty of the people of the United Kingdom over every part of the British Isles.

No. CCCCXLI will be published in July.

INDEX

A.

Arsenieff, U. V., 190.

Auguste Rodin and his French Critics, 74—Mlle. Cladel quoted, 75—'St. Jean Baptiste' exhibited (1880), 76—action portrayed in sculpture, 77—action in eighteenth century art, 78—Rodin on Houdon's 'Voltaire assis,' 79—David d'Angers, Rude, and Barye, 80—Rodin on Rude's 'Ney,' 81—Carpeaux's 'Triomphe de Flore' and the 'Danse,' 81—Rodin's early life, 82—his work and study in Belgium, 83—'L'Age d'Airain' and 'Monument de la Défense Nationale,' 84—'Gate of Hell,' 85—Victor Hugo's monument, 86—'M. Antonin Proust,' 87—works of Rodin in the Luxembourg, 88—'Bourgeois de Calais,' 89—statue of Balzac, 90—Paris Exhibition (1900), 91—Rodin's admiration for the antique, 92.

B.

Barclay, Sir Thomas, his article on 'Peace' in Encyclopaedia Britannica reviewed, 405.

Beaumont, André, 'Mes Trois Grandes Courses' reviewed, 141.

Berget, Alphonse, 'The Conquest of the Air' reviewed, 141.

Bergson, Henri, 'Laughter: An Essay on the Meaning of the Comic' reviewed, 383.

Black, Clementina, her translation of Camille Manclair's 'Auguste Rodin' reviewed, 74.

Boas, Franz, 'The Mind of Primitive Man' reviewed, 358.

Bray, Colonel d'Etat-Major Fd. de, 'Memoires du Comte de Bray: La Révolution Française et la Politique des Puissances Européennes' reviewed, 158.

Buttel-Reepen, Dr. H. v., 'Aus dem Werdegang der Menschheit' reviewed, 358.

Bywater, Ingram, 'Aristotle on the Art of Poetry' reviewed, 337.

C.

'*Cambridge History of English Literature, The*,' edited by A. W. Ward and A. R. Waller, reviewed, 31.

Canada during the Laurier Régime, 450—Sir John A. Macdonald, 450—Cayley and Galt tariffs, 452—tariffs of maritime provinces, 452—W. H. Fielding quoted, 453—Sir Wilfrid Laurier as leader of the Opposition, 454—the Ottawa programme, 455—the policy of the Liberal Press, 458—demand for reciprocity with United

States, 459—Sir Charles Tupper, 459—British tariff preference, 461 f.—farmers' delegation at Ottawa, 463—effect of the McKinley and Dingley tariffs on Canada, 464—Canadian exports to Germany, 465—commercial convention with France, 466 f.—Elgin-Marcy reciprocity treaty, 467—the Payne-Aldrich tariff, 468—Sir Wilfrid Laurier on concessions to the United States, 469 f.—creation of Board of Railway Commissioners, 471—Mr. Borden on railway legislation, 473—Sir Richard Cartwright, 474—Constitution of the Senate, 475—prohibition plebiscite, 476—payment of members, 477—Redistribution Act, 478—educational system, 479—Canadian immigration, 480 f.—the Lemieux Act, 482—the Canadian Navy, 482—developement of the Dominion, 483 f.

Cardinal Newman, 263—his literary style, 264—'Essay on Developement,' 265—foundation of Oratory at Birmingham, 265—Achilli libel action, 266—scheme for Catholic University in Ireland, 266—the 'Rambler,' 267—Newman's advocacy of the temporal power, 267—the Kingsley controversy, 269—'Apologia' and 'Grammar of Assent,' 270—Newman made a Cardinal, 271—'Lead, kindly Light,' 272—Mark Pattison on Oxford life, 273—Arnold and Keble, 274—the Tractarian movement, 274 f.—Newman's obscurantism, 277—Dr. Caldecott's 'Philosophy of Religion,' 278—Newman an upholder of the principle of authority, 279—Wordsworth and Browning on reason, 280—Locke on truth, 281—moral and intellectual weight of Church tradition, 283—the future of the Catholic Church, 284—Tyrrell, 'A Much-abused Letter,' 285—revolt against Catholic dogma, 286—the Vatican and Modernism, 287—Monsignor Talbot, 288—character of Newman, 289 f.

Changes of Current in Political Thought, 113—thoughts of a nation represented in politics, 113—the individualist era, 114—the collectivist period, 115—Sir Roland Wilson's 'The Province of the State,' 115 f.—collectivism does not object to individual ownership, 117—'Don Juan' quoted, 118—Herbert Spencer's 'The Principles of Ethics,' 119—compulsory military service, 120 f.—Dryden's 'Cymon and Iphigenia,' 121—care of the sick, criminals, and paupers, 122—the metric system, 123 f.—registration, 124—State education, 125—State patronage of science, art, and literature, 125—writers and associations which oppose socialism, 126 f.—objection to syndicalism as immoral, 128—Confédération Générale du Travail, 129—syndicalism in France and Belgium, 130—in Italy and Spain, 131—American Federation of Labour, 132—treatment of syndicalism, 133 f.—Hon. George Peel's 'The Future of England,' 136—summary of political change of last century, 137—campaign against disease, 138 f.

Chatham and the Country Life of his Day, 58—Dr. Johnson on landscape gardening, 59—The Leasowes and Hagley, 60—Sanderson Miller of Radway, 61, 68—'Lord Chatham's Ride' at Chevening, 62—South Lodge at Enfield Chace, 63—Wilkes's

comparison of Pitt and Rigby, 64—Pitt's library at South Lodge, 64 f.—sale of South Lodge, 66—John Pitt's seat, Encombe, 67—Pitt's attacks of gout, 69—at Tunbridge Wells, 70 f.—the Circus, Bath, 71—Ralph Allen, 72—Pitt's portrait by Hoare, 72—Wotton, 73.

Chatterton, Lady, 'Memorials of Admiral Gambier' reviewed, 58.

Childers, Erskine, 'The Framework of Home Rule' reviewed, 515.

'*China Imperial Maritime Customs, III.*' reviewed, 190.

Chipman, G. F., 'The Siege of Ottawa' reviewed, 450.

Cladel, Judith, 'Auguste Rodin, pris sur la Vie,' reviewed, 74.

Clay, Sir Arthur, 'Syndicalism and Labour' reviewed, 113.

Corbett, Julian S., 'Some Principles of Maritime Strategy,' 485.

Court of Star Chamber, The, 318—Gardiner's 'History of England' quoted, 318—origin of the name 'Star Chamber,' 319—Stow's description of the Star Chamber, 320—the aims and policy of Henry VII, 321—difference between the King's Council and the Court of Star Chamber, 322—Mayor *v.* Artificers of Newcastle, 323—Vale *v.* Broke, 324—Abbot of Shrewsbury's case, 325—relation of the Court to the social and economical life of the age, 326—the Mulsho case, 327 ff.—Information filed against Robert Danby of Walsingham and Thomas Toly of Boston, 330—Butchers of London *v.* Graziers, 331 f.—the Court under the Stuarts, 332—the cases of Chambers and Leighton, 333—letter of Thomas Lorken, 334—Idele *v.* Abbot of St. Bennett's Holme, 334 f.—Treherne *v.* Harcourt, 335—the Court abolished by the Long Parliament, 336.

Courtney of Penwith, Lord, 243.

Crane, William Leighton, 'The Passing of War' reviewed, 405.

D.

Déchelette, Joseph, 'Manuel d'Archéologie' reviewed, 358.

Dickens, Lilian, and Stanton May, 'An Eighteenth Century Correspondence' reviewed, 58.

Dircks, Rudolf, 'Auguste Rodin' reviewed, 74.

Doctrine in War, The Place of, 1—definitions, 2—principles of command, 3—relationship between doctrine and principles of command, 4—economy of forces, 5—Frederick and Napoleon compared, 6—Napoleon at Jena, 7—tribute to Lannes and Davout, 8—Napoleon's defeats examined, 9—Marshal Macdonald at Katsbach, 10—Napoleon's letters, 11—training of French marshals, 12—'Instructions for the Superior Leaders of Troops,' 13—Moltke's doctrine, 14—historical section of the Great General Staff, 15—Sadowa and Bistritz, 16—General Steinmetz at Spicheren and Gravelotte, 17—Russo-Japanese War, 18—study of war in Germany and France, 19—two distinct doctrines of war taught, 21—Is a doctrine desirable for the British Army? 22—French campaign in Italy (1796), 23—problems presented at Waterloo, 24—'doctrine of no doctrine,' 25 ff.—encouragement

of initiative, 28—conditions of training in Britain, 29—'Field Service Regulations (1909)' and 'Infantry Training (1911),' 29 f.
Donat, Karl von, his translation of Lieut.-General von Caemmerer's 'The Developement of Strategical Science during the Nineteenth Century' reviewed, 1.
Duckworth, W. L. H., 'Prehistoric Man' reviewed, 358.

E.

Elizabethan Playwright, The, 31—M. Jusserand's 'Ben Jonson on the Art of Shakespeare,' 31 f.—origins of the Elizabethan drama, 33—'Gorboduc' or 'Ferrex and Porrex,' 34—Professor Schelling's list of plays, 35—Thomas Heywood and John Day, 36—Ben Jonson, 37—Charles Lamb on Thomas Heywood, 38—Percy Simpson's 'Shakespearean Punctuation,' 38 f.—Shakespeare's indifference to the future of his manuscripts, 40—the drama and painting compared, 41—university dramatists, 42—Sidney's 'Defence of Poesie.' 43—'The Spanish Tragedy' and 'The Pinner of Wakefield,' 44—disappearance of the patron, 45—Middleton's 'A Game of Chess,' 46—Henslowe and Alleyn, 47—early days of Shakespeare, 48 f.—Marlowe's 'Tamburlaine,' 49—'Titus Andronicus,' 50—Shakespeare's reputation as a poet, 51—scanty references to Shakespeare in current literature, 52—his preference for the drama, 53—Jonson's contribution to drama, 54—'Comedy of Humours,' 55—Shakespeare's retirement, 56—his lack of close friends, 57.
Eversley, Lord, 'Gladstone and Ireland: the Irish Policy of Parliament from 1850 to 1894' reviewed, 515.

F.

'*Farmers' Delegation Report*, 1910,' reviewed, 450.
Findlay, Jessie P., 'The Spindle-Side of Scottish Song' reviewed, 213.
Flaubert, Gustave, 'Hérodias' reviewed, 291.
Fleay, F. H., 'Chronicle History of the English Stage' reviewed, 31.
Foch, Colonel F., 'Des Principes de la Guerre' reviewed, 1.
Fortescue, Hon. J. W., 'British Statesmen of the Great War (1793–1814)' reviewed, 158.
Foster, Henry Rumsey, 'The Stowe Catalogue' reviewed, 58.

G.

Great Britain and Europe, 243—Mr. Lloyd George as Chancellor, 244—Anglo-German tension, 245—Sir Edward Grey, 246—Henry Brougham quoted, 247—Mr. Gladstone's ideal, 248—Sir Robert Morier's 'Memoirs and Letters,' 248 f.—Sir Robert Morier on the Franco-German war, 250—Sir Edward Grey on the Moroccan difficulty, 251 f.—German claims in Africa, 252 f.—Mr. Lloyd George on the situation, 253—Mr. Bonar Law, 254 f.—Mr. Ramsay MacDonald and Lord Courtney of Penwith, 255 f.—Lord Lans-

downe, 256—war fleet of Germany, 257 f.—Fashoda, 259—American-Venezuela difficulty, 260—our friendly relations with France and Russia, 261.

Great Britain, Germany and Limited War, 485—Mr. Churchill on navies of Britain and Germany, 485 f.—Colomb's 'Naval Warfare,' 488—Admiral Mahan on naval strategy literature, 488 f.—Clausewitz's 'Vom Krieg,' 489—Mahan's 'Naval Strategy,' 490—Corbett's 'Some Principles of Maritime Strategy,' 491 f.—Napoleonic or unlimited war, 493—Clausewitz's conception of limited war, 494—Anglo-German limited war, 496—the unlimited counterstroke, 497—Mr. Corbett on the Russo-Japanese war, 498 f.—Japanese plan of operations, 500 f.—attack on Port Arthur, 502—Mr. Corbett's theory of maritime war, 503 f.—Mahan's 'Influence of Sea Power upon the French Revolution,' 506—protection of commerce, 508—Admiral Mahan on concentration, 509 f.—Germany and Walfisch Bay, 512—For what purpose is the German navy being created? 513 f.

Greg, W. W., 'Henslowe's Diary' and 'Papers' reviewed, 31.

Grey, Right Hon. Sir Edward, 243.

Gsell, Paul, 'L'Art. Auguste Rodin' reviewed, 74.

H.

Harper, H.: *see* White, C. Graham.

Hazlitt, William, 'Lectures on the English Comic Writers,' 383.

Hedgcock, F. A., 'Thomas Hardy, Penseur et Artiste' reviewed, 93.

Heine, H., 'Atta Troll, ein Sommernachts Traum' reviewed, 291.

Home Rule or a United Kingdom, 515—labour troubles, 516—the 'Minimum Bill,' 517—Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule Bills, 518—What are the outlines of present Bill? 520—Mr. Childers' 'The Framework of Home Rule,' 521—Ireland and Belgium compared, 522—financial independence of Ireland, 523—religious differences in Ireland, 524 f.—Financial Relations Commission, 525—Lord MacDonnell of Swinford, 526—land purchase scheme, 526—Mr. Childers on federal government, 527—Mr. John Bright on an Irish Parliament, 528—Home Rule for Scotland, 529 f.—Pitt's Act of Union, 531 f.—Mr. Edgar Crammond quoted, 533—Lord Eversley's 'Gladstone and Ireland,' 533 f.—Mr. Parnell quoted, 534—disturbances in Ulster, 535.

House of Herod in History and Art, The, 291—Herod made tetrarch in Judea by Mark Antony, 294—Herod's descent and character, 295—siege of Jerusalem, 296—Herod married to Mariamne, 296—death of Mark Antony, 297—birth of Herodias, 298—death of Herod, 299—marriage of Antipas and Herodias, 300—Holofernes and Judith, 301 f.—death of John the Baptist, 303—Giotto's 'Salome,' 304—treatment by other Italian artists, 305—by the Dutch school, 305—Heinrich Heine's 'Atta Troll,' 306 f.—Henri Regnault and Gustave Moreau, 308 f.—Flaubert's treatment of Salome, 310 f.—Oscar Wilde's 'Salome,' 312 f.—Strauss's

interpretation, 315—Herod-Antipas deposed, 316—Herod-Agrippa I. and Herod-Agrippa II., 317.
Hudson, William, 'Treatise of the Court of Star Chamber,' 318.

I.

International Map of the World, The, 434—discussion of British Association at Portsmouth on aero-maps, 435—Professor Penck, 436—choice of a universal meridian, 437—metric system proposed, 437 f.—Professor Wagner, 438—Istambul sheet, 439 f.—methods of production, 441—discretion should be used in dividing into sheets, 442—method of numbering sheets, 443—polyconic projection, 443—relief and contours, 444—hill-shading, 444 f.—layer system of colouring, 445 f.—Kenhardt sheet, 447—coloured contours suggested, 448—Colonel Close on keeping military maps secret, 449.

K.

Kahn, Rudolf, 'Auguste Rodin' reviewed, 74.
Keith, Arthur, 'Ancient Types of Man' reviewed, 358.

L.

Lankester, Sir Ray, 'Science from an Easy Chair' reviewed, 358.
Lansdowne, Marquess of, 243.
Laughter, 383—Schopenhauer's example of humour, 384—laughter the result of physical stimulation, 385—as a display of muscular excitement, 386—Herbert Spencer's 'The Physiology of Laughter,' 387—examples of 'descending incongruity,' 388—Kant's description, 389—George Eliot quoted, 390—the infectiousness of laughter, 392—the laughter of children, 392—training of the senses, 393—M. Bergson's theory, 394 f.—Hazlitt's 'Lectures on the English Comic Writers,' 396 f.—Professor Lilly's 'Essays on Literature and Religion,' 397—definition of the word 'humour,' 398—Thackeray and Meredith on humour, 399—Canon Ainger's 'Lectures and Essays,' 400—Landor and Lowell on wit, 401—Charles Lamb, 402—Barrow's description of humour, 404.
Lawton, Frederick, 'Life and Work of Auguste Rodin' reviewed, 74.
Leadam, I. S., 'Select Cases before the King's Council in the Star Chamber, commonly called the Court of Star Chamber,' 318.
Lecky, W. E. H., 'A History of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century' reviewed, 515.
Lémonon, Ernest, 'La seconde Conférence de la Paix' reviewed, 405.
'*Liberal Convention, Official Report of the,* 1893' reviewed, 450.
Logan, R. S., 'Synoptical History of the Grand Trunk System of Railways' reviewed, 450.

M.

Macdonnell of Swinford, Lord, 'The Finance of Irish Government' reviewed, 515.

Mahan, Captain A. T., 'Naval Strategy: compared and contrasted with the Principles and Practice of Military Operations on Land' reviewed, 485.
Malcolm, Captain Neill, his edition of Colonel G. F. R. Henderson's 'The Science of War' reviewed, 1.
Marett, R. R., 'Anthropology' reviewed, 358.
Margoliouth, D. S., 'The Poetics of Aristotle' reviewed, 337.
Mayers, W. F., 'Treaties between the Empire of China and Foreign Powers' reviewed, 190.
Meredith, George, 'An Essay on Comedy,' 383.
Morley of Blackburn, Lord, 243.
Morse, Hosea Ballou, 'The International Relations of the Chinese Empire' reviewed, 190.
Muhlenbeck, E., 'Etude sur les Origines de la Sainte Alliance,' 405.

N.

Newman, J. H., 'History of my Religious Opinions' reviewed, 263.

P.

Parker, E. H., 'China. Her History, Diplomacy and Commerce' reviewed, 190.
Peace Movement and the Holy Alliance, The, 405—Sir Thomas Barclay quoted, 405—Charles Richet, 406—Kant on peace, 407—Mead's 'Primer of the Peace Movement,' 408—Brewer's 'The Mission of the United States in the Cause of Peace,' 410—Truce of God, 410—early arbitration cases, 411—Sully's 'Memoirs' quoted, 411 f.—Abbé de St. Pierre, 412—Alexander I. and Napoleon, 413—Treaty of Chaumont, 414—Congress of Vienna, 414 f.—Friedrich von Gentz, 415—conversion of Alexander by Baroness von Krüdener, 416 f.—inception of the Holy Alliance, 417—Britain suspicious of the Alliance, 418—correspondence of Lord Castlereagh, 419 f.—necessity to widen the Quadruple Alliance, 421—Pozzo di Borgo, 422—attitude of Britain towards the Holy Alliance, 423 f.—American proposal to establish permanent Arbitral Court, 424—tribute to Lord Castlereagh, 425—essentials of the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle, 426—Capo d'Istria, 428—Troppau Protocol, 429—George Canning, 430—intervention of Tsar Nicholas in Hungary, 431—Sir Frederick Pollock, 432—problems before the new Holy Alliance, 433.
Peel, Hon. George, 'The Future of England' reviewed, 113.
Penck, Dr. Albrecht, 'Die Erdkarte im Massstab 1:1,000,000' reviewed, 434.
Phillips, W. Alison, 'Cambridge Modern History' reviewed, 405.
Poetics of Aristotle, The, 337—tribute to Mr. Bywater, 337—Margoliouth's 'Analecta Orientalia,' 338—Abu Bashar's Arabic version of the 'Poetics,' 339 f.—Butcher's 'Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art,' 341—Margoliouth 'On the Esoteric

Style,' 342—use of katharsis, 343—historical method of criticism, 344—influence of Plato on Aristotle, 345—imitation as a creative art, 346—effect of poetry on the emotions, 347—Jowett's translation of Plato's 'Laws,' 348—relative importance of plot and character, 349—technique in tragedy, 349—scanty references to the 'Poetics' in classical literature, 350—Springarn's 'Literary Criticism in the Renaissance,' 351—Scaliger, 352—discussion between Giraldi-Cintio and Trissino, 353—Castelvetro's edition of the 'Poetics,' 354 f.—Daniel Heinsius, 355—Corneille's 'Discourse on Tragedy,' 356—Rapin and Lessing, 357.

Prehistoric Man, 358—historical and scientific investigation, 359—Dr. Eugène Dubois: search for the 'missing link' in Java, 360 f.—probable period of the Pithecanthropus, 361—the Heidelberg jaw, 362—palaeolithic implements, 363—origin of eoliths, 364—geography of the palaeolithic era, 365—Mousterian man, 366—relationship between Mousterians and Australian aborigines, 367—bone and ivory implements, 368—cave paintings, 368—Grotte des Enfants, 369—Cromagnards, 369 f.—Neolithic man, 370—Bergson's 'Evolution Créatrice,' 371—connexion between mental superiority and size of brain, 372 f.—heredity and environment, 374—natural selection, 375—mental characteristics of primitive man, 375 f.—emotional traits of primitive man, 377 f.—association of ideas, 379—classification of colours and stars, 380—different methods of consuming food, 381—summary, 381 f.

R.

'*Rapport du Président de la Commission pour l'établissement d'une carte de la terre à l'échelle de* 1 : 1,000,000' reviewed, 434.

Renan, Ary, 'Gustave Moreau' reviewed, 291.

Resolutions and Proceedings of the International Map Committee assembled in London, November 1909' reviewed, 434.

Richet, Charles, 'Le Passé de la Guerre et l'Avenir de la Paix,' reviewed, 405.

Riotor, Léon, 'Rodin' reviewed, 74.

'*Rodin's Exhibition, Four Prefaces to* (1900),' reviewed, 74.

Rose, J. Holland, 'William Pitt and National Revival' and 'William Pitt and the Great War' reviewed, 158.

Russo-Chinese Relations (A.D. 1224–1912), 190—Mongol conquest of Russia and China, 191—conquest of Siberia, 192—mission of Petroff and Yalicheff, 193—that of Tumenets and Petroff, 194—Prince Kurákin's report to Tsar Michael, 195—Baikoff's expedition to China, 196—first overland tea in Russia, 197—Nicholas Gavrilovitch Spathary, 198—Treaty of Nerchinsk, 198—Everart Isbrandt Ides, 199—Treaty of Kiakhta, 199 f.—Mayers's 'Treaties between the Empire of China and Foreign Powers,' 200—maps of Russo-Chinese frontier, 201—Embassy of Golovkin, 202—treaties of Aigun and Tientsin, 203—that of Peking, 204—Treaty of St. Petersburg (1881), 204 f.—Cassini Convention, 206

—rebellion in Northern Mongolia, 207 f.—attitude of Russia towards Mongolian trouble, 209—outline of Chinese government in Mongolia, 210—Russian trade in China outside the Wall, 211—Russian railway extensions, 212.

S.

Schelling, F. C., 'Elizabethan Drama' reviewed, 31.
Scofield, Cora L., 'A Study of the Court of Star Chamber,' 318.
Scottish Songstresses, 213—Lord Napier and Ettrick, 214—'Annie Laurie,' 214—the Scottish muse flouted by the Reformers, 215 f.—English and Scottish literature in the seventeenth century, 217—Percy's 'Reliques,' 218—'Complaynt of Scotland,' 219—Lady Wardlaw, 220—Lady Grisell Baillie, 220 f.—Mrs. Cockburn, 221 f.—Miss Rutherford, 223—Jean Elliot, 224 f.—Lady Anne Lindsay, 226 f.—'Auld Robin Gray,' 227—Lady Nairne, 228 f.—'The Land o' the Leal,' 229—Lady John Scott, 230 f.—death of Lady Hume Campbell, 231—C. K. Sharpe, 232—definition of a ballad, 233—the ballad-monger, 234 f.—Jacobite songs, 236 f.—Alexander Macdonald, 237—John Roy Stuart, 238—Culloden, 239—'Durisdeer' and 'Ettrick,' 240 f.—Lady John Russell, 242.
Sollas, W. J., 'Ancient Hunters and their modern Representatives' reviewed, 358.
Sovereignty of the Air, The, 141—the importance of a Navy, 141—early achievements in aviation, 142—M. Beaumont on the sensations of flying, 143—M. Berget's proposal for exploring Africa, 144—Captain Burke quoted, 145 f.—use of the aeroplane in war, 146—organisation of French air corps, 147—British 'aeroplane policy,' 148—French military aeroplanes, 149—private patronage of aeronautics, 150—Colonel Seeley on the British aero corps, 151 f.—the 'Lebaudy' and the 'Clément Bayard,' 153—Colonel Capper quoted, 154—efficiency suggestions for British aero fleet, 154 f.—charting of the air, 156.
Spencer, Herbert, 'The Physiology of Laughter,' 383.
Stanton, May: *see* Dickens, Lilian.
Sully, James, 'An Essay on Laughter' reviewed, 383.
Suttner, Bertha von, 'Memoiren' reviewed, 405.

T.

'*Transcontinental Railway Report*' reviewed, 450.

V.

Vassilieff, V. P., 190.

W.

Ward, Wilfrid, 'The Life of John Henry Cardinal Newman,' 263.
Warrender, Margaret, her edition of Lady John Scott's 'Songs and Verses' reviewed, 213.

Wemyss, Mrs. Rosslyn, 'Memoirs and Letters of the Right Hon. Sir Robert Morier, G.C.B., from 1828 to 1876' reviewed, 243.

Wessex Drama, The, 93—tribute to M. Hedgcock, 93—Thomas Hardy as Penseur et Artiste, 94—'Far from the Madding Crowd,' 95—'Past and Present Poems,' 96—life in Dorset, 97—'Two on a Tower.' 98—'Under the Greenwood Tree,' 99 f.—Matthew Arnold, 100—estimate of Tennyson and Browning, 101—'Tess of the 'D'Urbervilles,' 101—the sex problem, 102—low estimate of women, 103—R. L. Stevenson and Hardy contrasted, 104 f.—Hardy's characters too passive, 106—case against received beliefs and institutions, 106 f.—necessity or fate, 108—'The Dynasts,' 109—Hardy and George Meredith compared, 111—the artist as a teacher, 112.

Whately's 'Observations on Modern Gardening' reviewed, 58.

Whiston, William, his translation of Josephus's 'The Antiquities of the Jews,' 291.

White, C. Graham, and Harper, H., 'The Aeroplane, Past, Present, and Future' reviewed, 141.

Wilde, Oscar, 'Salomé' reviewed, 291.

William Pitt, 158—Lord Stanhope's 'Life of Pitt,' 158—Dr. Rose's 'Life of William Pitt,' 159—'Mémoires du Comte de Bray,' 159, 169—industrial developement, 161—Parliamentary reform, 162—Commercial Treaty with France (1786), 163—English ships seized by Spain, 164—Russia and partition of Poland, 165—Pitt's attitude towards the French Revolution, 166 f.—Herbert Marsh, 168—'Mémoires sur la Révolution' of the Marquis de Bouillé, 168—Talleyrand's mission to England, 170 f.—manifesto of the Duke of Brunswick, 171—Valmy, 172—Burke quoted, 173—Anglo-Dutch Alliance of 1788, 174 f.—France declares war against England, 177—Belgium as seat of war, 178—strength of allied army, 179—Duke of York appointed to command, 180—troubles in the Navy, 181—Hood at Toulon, 182—Macaulay quoted, 183—Lord Stanhope's 'History of England,' 184—naval and military commanders, 185—Pitt's policy in relation to sedition-mongers and Jacobins, 186—Ireland and Irish affairs, 187—Union with Ireland, 188—bribery used to carry the Union, 189.

Wilson, Sir Roland K., 'The Province of the State' reviewed, 113.

END OF VOL. CCXV.

Spottiswoode & Co. Ltd., Printers, Colchester, London and Eton.

124253

Edinburgh Review.
Vol. 215, 1912.

P
LE
E

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
LIBRARY

Do not
remove
the card
from this
Pocket.

Acme Library Card Pocket
Under Pat. "Ref. Index File."
Made by LIBRARY BUREAU